RPTS JANSEN

DCMN HERZFELD

PPACA IMPLEMENTATION FAILURES: ANSWERS FROM HHS
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2013
House of Representatives,
Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:02 a.m., in Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Upton, Hall, Barton, Whitfield,
Shimkus, Pitts, Walden, Terry, Rogers, Murphy, Burgess, Blackburn,
Gingrey, Scalise, Latta, McMorris Rodgers, Harper, Lance, Cassidy,
Guthrie, Olson, McKinley, Gardner, Pompeo, Kinzinger, Griffith,
Bilirakis, Johnson, Long, Ellmers, Waxman, Dingell, Pallone, Eshoo,
Engel, Green, DeGette, Capps, Doyle, Schakowsky, Matheson,

Butterfield, Barrow, Matsui, Christensen, Castor, Sarbanes, McNerney, Braley, Welch, Lujan, Tonko and Yarmuth.

Staff Present: Clay Alspach, Chief Counsel, Health; Carl Anderson, Counsel, Oversight; Gary Andres, Staff Director; Ray Baum, Senior Policy Advisor/Director of Coalitions; Mike Bloomquist, General Counsel; Sean Bonyun, Communications Director; Matt Bravo, Professional Staff Member; Megan Capiak, Staff Assistant; Karen Christian, Chief Counsel, Oversight; Noelle Clemente, Press Secretary; Paul Edattel, Professional Staff Member, Health; Brad Grantz, Policy Coordinator, O&I; Sydne Harwick, Legislative Clerk; Brittany Havens, Legislative Clerk; Sean Hayes, Counsel, O&I; Kirby Howard, Legislative Clerk; Alexa Marrero, Deputy Staff Director; Nick Magallanes, Policy Coordinator, CMT; Carly McWilliams, Professional Staff Member, Health; Brandon Mooney, Professional Staff Member; Gib Mullan, Chief Counsel, CMT; Katie Novaria, Professional Staff Member, Health; Monica Popp, Professional Staff Member, Health; Andrew Powaleny, Deputy Press Secretary; Chris Sarley, Policy Coordinator, Environment & Economy; Heidi Stirrup, Health Policy Coordinator; John Stone, Counsel, Oversight; Tim Torres, Deputy IT Director; Tom Wilbur, Digital Media Advisor; Jessica Wilkerson, Staff Assistant; Ziky Ababiya, Minority Staff Assistant; Phil Barnett, Minority Staff Director; Stacia Cardille, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel; Brian Cohen, Minority Staff

Director, Oversight & Investigations/Senior Policy Advisor; Hannah Green, Minority Staff Assistant; Elizabeth Letter, Minority Assistant Press Secretary; Karen Lightfoot, Minority Communications Director and Senior Policy Advisor; Karen Nelson, Minority Deputy Committee Staff Director for Health; Stephen Salsbury, Minority Special Assistant; Roger Sherman, Minority Chief Counsel; and Matt Siegler, Minority Counsel.

The <u>Chairman.</u> Good morning, everyone. Good morning. Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Good morning.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Energy and Commerce Committee welcomes the President's point person on health care, Secretary Sebelius, as part of our continuing oversight of the healthcare law, and we look forward to a thoughtful conversation on a number of issues, including transparency and fairness.

Over the months leading up to October 1 launch, the Secretary and her colleagues at HHS repeatedly looked us in the eye and testified that everything was on track, and despite the numerous red flags and lack of testing, they assured us that all systems were a go. But something happened along the way. Either those officials did not know how bad the situation was, or they did not disclose it. And sadly, here we are now 5 weeks into enrollment, and the news seems to get worse by the day.

HealthCare.gov was down last night at 5 o'clock p.m. It was also down on Monday, and it crashed last weekend. And even this morning when we attempted to view the site before the hearing, we were hit with an error message.

But this is more than just a Web site problem. That was supposed to be the easy part, remember? Americans were assured that their experience would be similar to other online transactions, like

purchasing a flight or ordering a pizza, and that their sensitive personal information would always be secure. But after more than 3 years to prepare, malfunctions have become the norm, and the administration has pivoted from saying they're on track to setting a new target date of November 30th. And for those few Americans who have successfully applied, well, the Web site glitches become provider glitches come January 1st.

Americans are scared and frustrated, and this situation should rise above politics. Many folks at home watching us today have spent hours or even days trying to sign up. They continue to take time away from work or loved ones, but have made little progress, and soon they may worry about being on the wrong side of their government, facing potential penalties.

I recently spoke to a woman from Buchanan, Michigan, who was excited to sign up, but has since become very disillusioned after spending hours on the phone and Web site with little success. There are also millions of Americans coast to coast who no doubt believed that the President repeated promises that if they liked their plan, that they would be able to keep it, no matter what. They are now receiving termination notices, and for those who lose their coverage, they like -- they may be losing their faith in their government.

Today's hearing is about fairness for the American people who are

losing their coverage or seeing their premiums skyrocket as high as 400 percent. This hearing is also about transparency. While the administration continues to boast the number of Americans that have applied, they intentionally withhold precise enrollment numbers. Why? These numbers are critical to fully understand the status engaging the progress of implementation.

Lead contractor CGI testified only last week that they had the data, but needed the administration's permission to release it. We asked the Secretary on October 8th for those figures, but we still have not received a response. We hope to get one today. The American people deserve answers as well as the peace of mind that promises will be kept. The Secretary has an opportunity today to embrace transparency and start restoring the public's faith in the administration and the government.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Upton follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

The <u>Chairman.</u> I yield to my colleague, the ranking member of the committee, Mr. Waxman.

Mr. Waxman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased Secretary Sebelius is here today. She's here to discuss the Affordable Care Act. Just like with Medicare Part D, the launch of the new Web site has not gone well, but just like Medicare Part D, the early glitches in this rollout will soon be forgotten.

A lot of the discussion today will focus on that Web site. This is an important issue, and I want to learn what the Secretary can tell us about the problems being experienced and how they will be fixed.

But we should keep this issue in perspective. The Affordable Care Act is working. It has been improving the health security of millions of Americans for the past 3 years. Because of the Affordable Care Act, more than 7 million people on Medicare have saved more than \$8 billion on their prescription drugs. More than 100 million Americans have access to preventive coverage and no longer face lifetime limits on their coverage. Over 10 million Americans have received rebates from insurance companies. And, finally, this January, the worst abuses of insurance industry will be halted. Never again will a family be denied coverage because their child has a chronic health condition. Never again will individuals see their premiums shoot up because they got sick or faced an unexpected medical expense.

Never again will a woman have to pay twice as much as a man for the same insurance.

That is why allowing insurers to continue offering deficient plans next year is such a bad policy. The law says that all plans except those that were grandfathered in 2010 must meet the new consumer protection standards. If we don't enforce this policy, insurance companies can continue offering flimsy coverage that disappears when people actually need it. And no one should want that.

It is understandable that there will be a focus today on what isn't working, but we must also remember what is working. The health insurance plans that are being offered in the exchange are good plans; their premiums are much lower than expected. Sixty percent of the uninsured individuals shopping in the new marketplaces will be able to get coverage for less than \$100 per month. Half of the young adults will be able to get coverage for less than \$50 per month. And since Congress adopted the Affordable Care Act, healthcare costs across the whole economy have grown at their lowest level in decades.

The success of the Affordable Care Act is due to the efforts of many people, but one individual more than any other is responsible for all the good that has been accomplished, and that is our witness today Secretary Sebelius.

So I would urge my colleagues to stop hyperventilating. The

problems with HealthCare.gov are unfortunate, and we should investigate them, but they will be fixed, and then every American will finally have access to affordable health insurance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Waxman follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

The <u>Chairman</u>. Before we swear in Secretary Sebelius, I want to clarify Energy and Commerce Committee practice for the swearing in of witnesses. The committee typically has two types of hearings, oversight hearings and hearings that focus on legislation and policy. Secretary Sebelius, for example, has testified previously before our committee to discuss issues related to the HHS budget or other policy matters. As is the case with all policy witnesses, Secretary Sebelius was not required to take the oath prior to testifying.

Today's hearing is different. It is an oversight hearing. It is a long-standing committee practice to swear in all witnesses at oversight hearings, whether they be private citizens or Cabinet Secretaries.

Mr. <u>Waxman</u>. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your comments, and I just want to join you in simply explaining that swearing in of a witness before an oversight committee hearing has always been under oath. That is a standard procedure of this committee when we're conducting an oversight hearing. So it may seem strange to have the Secretary of Health and Human Services have to be sworn in, but all witnesses in an oversight hearing are sworn in, and that is our procedure.

The Chairman. Thank you.

So I would now like to introduce our witness for today's hearing.

The Honorable Kathleen Sebelius is the Secretary of the Department of

Health and Human Services. She was appointed to this position in April of 2009, and was sworn in as the 21st Secretary on April 28th, 2009.

So I will now swear you in, if you would rise.

As Ranking Waxman and I just discussed, the committee is holding an investigative hearing, and, when doing so, have had the practice of taking testimony under oath.

Do you have any objection to testifying under oath? Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, sir.

The <u>Chairman.</u> And the chair now advises you that you are -- I will now read you the oath.

[Witness sworn.]

The <u>Chairman</u>. You are now under oath and subject to the penalties set forth in Title 18, section 1001 of the U.S. Code.

You may now give a 5-minute summary of your written statement. Welcome again, and thank you for being here.

TESTIMONY OF HON. KATHLEEN SEBELIUS, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, thank you, Chairman Upton.

The <u>Chairman.</u> You got to use that mic. You don't know how many people want to hear you this morning.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Thank you, Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Waxman, members of the committee.

I left my position as Governor of Kansas 4-1/2 years ago for the opportunity to continue work I've been doing for most of my over 35 years of public service; to expand the opportunities for all Americans regardless of geography, or gender, or income to have affordable health coverage. During my years as a State legislator, as an elected insurance commissioner, as head of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and as a two-term Governor, and now as HHS Secretary, I have worked on that effort that I care deeply about.

There are still millions of Americans who are uninsured as well as underinsured, people who have some coverage at some price for some illness, but have no real protection from financial ruin and no real confidence they'll be able to take care of themselves and their families if they have an accident or an illness. And for them a new day has

finally come.

In these early weeks access to HealthCare.gov has been a miserably frustrating experience for way too many Americans, including many who have waited years, in some cases their entire lives, for the security of health insurance. I am as frustrated and angry as anyone with the flawed launch of HealthCare.gov, so let me say directly to these Americans, you deserve better. I apologize. I'm accountable to you for fixing these problems, and I'm committed to earning your confidence back by fixing the site.

We're working day and night and will continue until it's fixed. We've recently added new management talent, additional technical expertise, and a new general contractor to identify, prioritize, and manage fixes across the system in two broad categories: performance, which deals with speed and reliability; and function, which deals with bugs and problems in the system.

Our extensive assessment has determined that HealthCare.gov is fixable, and I want to just outline a couple of the improvements we've made to date. We now have more users successfully creating accounts. We can process up to 17,000 account registrations per hour, or nearly 5 per second. Instead of some of the users seeing a blank screen at the end of the application process, they can now see whether they're eligible for financial assistance and make more informed decisions.

Because we've improved performance, customers can now shop for plans quickly; filtering plans takes seconds, not minutes. Users are getting fewer errors and timeout messages as they move through the application process. And the system has been strengthened with double the size of servers, software that's better optimized, and a high-capacity physical database which replaces a virtual system.

The chairman referred to outages this weekend and again yesterday, and I would suggest to the committee that if you read the statement of Verizon, who hosts the cloud service, it is the Verizon server that failed, not HealthCare.gov, and it affected not only HHS, but other customers.

We still have a lot of work to do. We have a plan in place to address key outstanding issues. It includes fixing bugs in software that prevented it from working the way it's supposed to, and refreshing the user experience so folks can navigate the site without encountering error messages, timeout, and slow response times. And by the end of November, we're committed that the vast majority of users will be able to review their options, shop for plans, and enroll in coverage without the problems way too many have been experiencing.

But consumers are using the site every day and continue to do so, and problems are being solved, but we know that we don't have a fully functioning system that consumers need and deserve. We are still at

the beginning of a 6-month open enrollment which extends through the end of March, and there's plenty of time to sign up. Just to put it in perspective, the average open enrollment for an insurance plan is 2 to 4 weeks. The new marketplace has a 26-week open enrollment, and those who enroll by December 15th will be able to access their benefits on day one.

Even with the unacceptable problems with HealthCare.gov, which we are committed to fixing, the Affordable Care Act by any fair measure is working for millions of Americans who are benefiting from new health security, young adults, Americans living with preexisting health conditions, seniors on Medicare. The 85 percent of Americans who already have health coverage are protected with new rights and benefits. The 15 percent of our neighbors and friends who are uninsured have affordable new options in a competitive market. And cost growth for health care is lower than it's been in years.

Millions of Americans are clearly eager to learn about their options and to finally achieve health security made possible by the Affordable Care Act. My commitment is to deliver on that promise.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Well, thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Sebelius follows:]

****** INSERT 1-1 ******

The <u>Chairman.</u> If you -- the mike got pulled a little bit from you.

I appreciate you being here this morning, and we worked with our leadership to see that we don't have votes on the House floor this morning so we won't be interrupted. I appreciate your -- your -- your time for sure. And in an effort to allow every Member to ask a question, we're going to be reducing the time for questions to be just 4 minutes so that hopefully we can get through all the Members that are here. And I'm going to be pretty fast with the gavel, let me just say. So we've got plenty of questions, so let's try and get through them.

You know, I think everyone in America remembers the President's words: "If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it. Period." Under the Affordable Care Act, insurance policies that were in effect on March 23rd, 2010, when the law was enacted, would be grandfathered. Then a few months later, despite the President's word, you all at HHS helped promulgate a new reg that in your own review showed that it effectively could deny perhaps as many as more than 50 percent, maybe even higher, of those holding individual policies the right to renew their own insurance plan.

And I would guess that there are a lot of us on this panel today that are hearing from angry and confused constituents, who are now being forced to go onto an inept Web site, whether they like it or not, to

shop for a new replacement policy. They're finding premiums often more than 100 percent what they're paying before, some even as high as 400 percent, as I've heard from, and rising deductibles as well.

So when was the President specifically informed of the regulation change? And, if so, was it pointed out that this totally undermines his biggest selling point?

And I would note that on the screen in the statement that he made more than 3 years after the regulation change was promulgated, the President said again, "So the first thing you need to know is this: If you already have health care, you don't have to do anything."

So he's been on the same page from the very start, yet the regulations changed months after the bill was enacted that are now causing perhaps millions of Americans to be denied the ability to renew their individual coverage.

Why was that change made, and did the President know it?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, Mr. Chairman, there was no change. The regulation involving grandfathered plans, which applied to both the employer market and the individual market, indicated that if a plan was in effect in March of 2010 stayed in effect without unduly burdening the consumer with reducing benefits and adding on huge costs, that plan would stay in effect and never have to comply with any of the regulations of the Affordable Care Act. That's what the grandfather clause said.

The individual market, which affects about 12 million Americans, about 5 percent of the market, people move in and out, they often have coverage for less than a year, a third of them have coverage for about 6 months, and if a plan was in place in March of 2010 and again did not impose additional burdens on the consumer, they still have it. It's grandfathered in.

The <u>Chairman</u>. But why not let the consumer decide whether they want to renew it or not? Why were regulations promulgated in the summer of 2010 that then undermined the ability for those folks to re-sign up, which is one the reasons for the large number of cancellation notices?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. There were no regulation change. We outlined the grandfather policy so people could keep their own plan. We then began to implement the other features of the Affordable Care Act. So if someone is buying a brand new policy in the individual market today or last week, they will have consumer protections for the first time. Many people in the under -- individual market are medically underwritten. That will be illegal. Many women are charged 50 percent more than men. That will be illegal. You cannot again eliminate someone because of a preexisting health condition, you can't dump someone out or lock someone out.

So those provisions -- but if, again, a plan is in place and was

in place at the time that the President signed the bill, and the consumer wants to keep the plan, those individuals are grandfathered in, and that's happening across the country in the individual market.

The <u>Chairman</u>. We're learning, in fact, that folks who did have a plan who liked it, in fact, are being told that it's canceled in the last -- my time has expired. Let me yield to the ranking member Mr. Waxman for 4 minutes.

Mr. <u>Waxman.</u> Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had to smile at your line of questioning because everybody expected this hearing was about the Web site. That's all we've been hearing about is the Web site.

But that's not the only complaint we've been hearing about since the Affordable Care Act was adopted. We were told by our Republican friends that millions of jobs would be lost, and, in fact, there have been a gain of 7 million jobs. They said that the -- the costs for health care would skyrocket, and, in fact, the opposite is true. They said there would be a massive shift to part-time jobs, and the evidence doesn't support that. They said tens of millions will lose their insurance, but, in fact, everybody in this country is going to have access to health insurance because they won't be discriminated against. They said that it would explode the deficit, and yet all the reputable organizations, like the Congressional Budget Office, have told us that

it's going to save us \$100 billion over 10 years.

So we've had a litary of objections from the Republicans about the Affordable Care Act, which has driven them to such a frenzy, they even closed the government.

So now we have you before the committee. And you're being asked -- I suppose later you'll be asked about the Web site. But let me pursue this question about individuals who have gotten notices that they're going to have their individual insurance policies canceled. They'll be able to get another plan, won't they?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Actually, it's the law that they must get another plan. Continuous coverage is part of the law.

Mr. Waxman. So --

Secretary Sebelius. And that wasn't the case in the past.

Mr. <u>Waxman</u>. So the Affordable Care Act, we're going to end the worst abuses of insurance companies, we're going to create consumer protections in the marketplace that they will be able to buy a policy even if they've been sick in the past, that women won't be charged more than men, that we're not going to let insurance companies deny coverage because of preexisting conditions, and we're not going to let them put these lifetime caps. And there will be an essential benefit package, so you're not just buying some things and not having other things covered, you're going to have the minimum that everybody should have:

prescription drugs, mental health coverage, doctors and hospitals.

Are these important consumer protections?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I would say, Mr. Waxman, they're very important. As a former insurance commissioner, I can tell you that the individual market in Kansas and anywhere in the country has never had consumer protections. People are on their own. They could be locked out, priced out, dumped out, and that happened each and every day. So this will finally provide the kind of protections that we all enjoy in our healthcare plans. As part of a group, as part of a plan that has prenegotiated benefits, we enjoy that kind of health security. And individuals in the -- buying insurance on their own, farm families, entrepreneurs mom-and-pop shops, young adults have never had that kind of health security.

Mr. <u>Waxman.</u> Well, now they're going to have this health security. And most of the plans, as I understand it, that they're no longer going to be able to keep don't meet all the standards of the law.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, again, I think you may have heard Pat Geraghty from Florida Blues, who was on some of the Sunday shows, and he talks about the fact that the Florida plans want to keep their customers. They have new plans to offer. They feel that a lot of people, and these are Mr. Geraghty's words, will have a much better

plan at a similar or lower cost; 50 percent of these 11- to 12 million people qualify for a subsidy, qualify for some financial help purchasing insurance for the first time ever.

Mr. <u>Waxman</u>. The bottom line is that people with good coverage, like Medicare, Medicaid, employer coverage, can keep that. People with grandfathered plans in the individual market will be able to keep it. But if insurance companies sold you a new, modified health insurance policy after the date of the enactment that does not meet the law's standards, then those people will be able to go into the exchange and buy a real solid health insurance plan that won't discriminate against them or anybody else. I think that's a good result, I'm pleased with it, and I think most people will be as well.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

The chair would recognize the vice chair of the committee Ms. Blackburn.

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, during -- before, during, and after the law was passed, the President kept saying, "If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it." So is he keeping his promise?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, he is.

Mrs. <u>Blackburn.</u> Okay. What do you say to the 300,000 people in Florida you just mentioned or to the 28,000 in Tennessee that cannot

get health insurance, their plans are terminated? Is he keeping his promise to them?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, first of all, Congresswoman, they can get health insurance. They must be offered new plans, new options, either inside the marketplace, or if they don't qualify for a financial subsidy, they can shop in or out of the marketplace.

Mrs. <u>Blackburn</u>. What do you say to --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. They absolutely will have new coverage.

Mrs. <u>Blackburn.</u> What do you say to NBC News, who says millions are going to lose their coverage?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. In all deference to the press corps, many of whom are here today, I think that it's -- it's important to be accurate about what is going on, and I would defer again to the president of the Blues plan. People will have ongoing coverage, they will be offered new plans --

Mrs. <u>Blackburn.</u> Madam Secretary, let me tell you something -- Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- in the market right now will qualify --

Mrs. <u>Blackburn.</u> What do you say to Mark and Lucinda in my district who had a plan, they liked it, it was affordable, but it is being terminated, and now they do not have health insurance?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Insurance companies cancel individual policies year in and year out. They are a 1-year contract with

individuals. They are not lifetime plans. They are not an employer plan. Your constituents will have lots have options in the market.

Ms. <u>Blackburn.</u> I will remind you, some people like to drive a Ford, not a Ferrari, and some people like to drink out of a red Solo cup, not a crystal stem. You're taking away their choice.

Let's put the screen shot up.

I want to go to the cost of the Web site and talk about the Web site. This is what is happening right now with this Web site. We've had somebody in the back trying to sign on. It is down. It is not working.

Last week I asked for the cost from each of the contractors that were with us last week. So can you give me a ballpark of what you have spent on this Web site that does not work that individuals cannot get to? What is your cost estimate?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. So far, Congresswoman, we have spent about \$118 million on the Web site itself, and about \$56 million has been expended on other IT to support the Web.

Ms. <u>Blackburn.</u> Okay. Would you submit a detailed accounting of exactly what has been spent? And when do you expect constituents to stop getting these kind of error messages?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Again, I was with the -- talked to the president of Verizon over the weekend on two occasions. Verizon hosts

the cloud, which is not part of the Web site; it is a host for a number of Web sites.

Mrs. <u>Blackburn</u>. Right.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. The Verizon system was taken down Saturday night into Sunday. It was down almost all day Sunday. They had an additional problem that they notified us about yesterday, and it continues on. So I'd be happy to talk to the president of Verizon and get him to give you information about the Web site.

Ms. <u>Blackburn</u>. Let me come back to that, because I want to get to this issue of exactly who was in charge of this project, because you're now blaming it on the contractors and saying it's Verizon's fault.

So let me ask you this: Did you ever look at outsourcing the role of the system integrator? And obviously you did not, from the contractors that we had last week. You all -- they had several different people, whether it was you, or Gary Cohen, or Michelle Snyder, or Henry Chao, that they thought were in charge. So who is responsible for overseeing this project? Is it you or your designee?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Let me be clear, I'm not pointing fingers at Verizon, I'm trying to explain the way the site operates. We are -- we own the sites. The site has had serious problems. I know that --

Ms. <u>Blackburn.</u> Who is in charge, Madam Secretary?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> The person now in charge as an integrator is QSSI, one of our --

Ms. <u>Blackburn.</u> Who was in charge as it was being built -Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> The CMS team was in charge up 'til -Ms. <u>Blackburn.</u> At that team, who is the individual -Secretary Sebelius. Michelle Snyder is the --

Mrs. <u>Blackburn.</u> Michelle Snyder is the one responsible for this debacle.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, excuse me, Congresswoman, Michelle Snyder is not responsible for the debacle. Hold me accountable for the debacle. I'm responsible.

Mrs. <u>Blackburn.</u> Okay. Thank you. I yield back.

The <u>Chairman.</u> The chair recognizes Mr. Dingell from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. <u>Dingell</u>. Thank you for your courtesy. I have a few questions I'll be asking on behalf of the Congresswoman Shea-Porter, but I'll do that by writing. I ask unanimous consent that I be prepared to revise and extend my remarks.

The <u>Chairman.</u> Without objection.

[The information follows:]

***** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Mr. <u>Dingell.</u> Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by thanking you, welcoming the Secretary to a room in which her distinguished father, former Governor of Ohio, served for so many years.

I begin my questions by quoting from an expert for whom I have enormous respect. He said as follows: "As I mentioned earlier, the new benefits and its implementation are hardly perfect. Rather than trying to secure and to scare and confuse seniors, I would hope that we could work together as we go through the implementation phase to find out what is wrong with the program and if we can make some changes to fix it. Let us do it, and let us do it in a bipartisan fashion. It is too big a program and is too important to too many people to do that. But having said that, it does appear that it is working. Let us admit it, you know, and not keep beating a dead horse." My beloved friend Mr. Barton, who I think gave us the beginning of our efforts today.

Madam Secretary, I've seen reports of consumers receiving plan cancellation notices from their insurance companies saying that plans are no longer available. Does the ACA require insurance companies to discontinue the plans that people had when the law was passed, yes or no?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Not when the law was passed if the plans have not changed. No, sir. That's the grandfather clause.

Mr. <u>Dingell.</u> Now, that's because the plans that existed prior to the passage of the law are grandfathered in, as you have said.

Secretary Sebelius. That's correct.

Mr. <u>Dingell</u>. So if an insurance company is no longer offering a certain plan, that's because that insurance company made a decision to change their policies, and that caused them to take away the grandfathered status from the insurance purchaser; is that right?

Secretary Sebelius. That is correct.

Mr. <u>Dingell</u>. Now, Madam Secretary, I want you to submit for the record a statement of what it is we can do about insurance companies that run around canceling the policies of their people. And I don't have time to get the answer, but I want to get a very clear statement from you as to what you can do so we can take some skin off some folks that have it coming.

[The information follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Again --

Mr. <u>Dingell</u>. Madam Secretary, it's my understanding that these decisions of a business character are most common in the individual insurance market, and that much turnover already exists and existed prior to the enactment of the legislation.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's correct.

Mr. <u>Dingell.</u> Is that correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Dingell</u>. Is it correct that 35 to 67 percent of the enrollees in the individual market leave their plan after 1 year for different reasons?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. A third are in about less than 6 months in the individual market, and over 50 percent are in for less than a year, yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Dingell</u>. Now, in the cancellation letters which move around from the insurance companies, some insurance companies are suggesting an alternative plan at a higher price. Do they have the right to do that?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, they have a right to do that, sir, but consumers have a right to shop anywhere to compare plans, and they have choices now that they've never had before and some financial assistance coming their way for about 50 percent of those people.

Mr. <u>Dingell.</u> And they have no right to enforce that -- Secretary Sebelius. Oh, absolutely not.

Mr. Dingell. -- demand on the insurance --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No one is rolled over into a plan. And, in fact, individuals for the first time ever will have the ability to compare plans, to shop, and to make a choice inside or outside the marketplace.

Mr. <u>Dingell</u>. Looks to me like the insurance companies are trying to inflict on their customers the view that this is their right, and that this is the only option available to them; is that correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I -- I think that insurance companies would like to keep their customers. Having said that, customers for the first time have a lot of choices because they can't be locked out of the --

Mr. <u>Dingell</u>. Companies have no right to enforce that view on the customer.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. There is no rule that says you have to stay with your company or you have to be rolled over.

Mr. <u>Dingell.</u> And you don't have to believe them --

The <u>Chairman.</u> Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. <u>Dingell.</u> -- when they come forward and tell you that you've got to buy a particular policy; is that right?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Absolutely.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

The chair would recognize the gentlemen from Texas Mr. Barton.

Mr. <u>Barton</u>. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I ask my questions, we have a former member of the committee on the Democrat side from the great State of Kansas in the audience, Mr. Slattery. And we're glad to have you.

And, Madam Secretary, we're glad to have you, too.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Thank you, sir.

Mr. <u>Barton</u>. There is a famous movie called The Wizard of Oz, and in The Wizard of Oz, there was a great line. Dorothy, at some point in the movie, turns to her little dog Toto and says, "Toto, we're not in Kansas anymore." Well, Madam Secretary, while you're from Kansas, we're not in Kansas anymore. Some might say that we are actually in The Wizard of Oz land, given the parallel universes we appear to be habitating. Mr. Waxman and most of those on the Democrat side think things are great. You, apparently, although you did apologize, and you have said it's a debacle, you also seem to think that the Affordable Care Act is great. Well, myself and others have a different view. Ultimately the American people will decide.

Now, last week, when the contractors were here, I focused my attention on the apparent lack of privacy in the Web site.

If we'll put up the first slide that I had last week, if we can.

This is what's public, Madam Secretary, and it's basically a disclaimer that says that any unauthorized attempt to upload information or change information on the Web site is prohibited. It really doesn't say anything about privacy. But you do have to accept that in order to go forward with the application.

The next slide shows what's not public. This is in the source code. We tried to determine this morning if it was still in the source code, but it's been pointed out the Web site is down.

This is much more, what I would say, frightening to me. It says you have no reasonable expectation of privacy regarding any communication or data transiting or stored on the information system. At any time and for any lawful government purpose, the government may monitor, intercept, search and seize any communication or data transiting or stored on the information system. Any communication or data transiting or stored on this information system may be disclosed or used for any lawful government purpose.

Cheryl Campbell of CGI Federal said she was aware of it, but said that it wasn't her responsibility to put that in the source code. Were you aware of it, and was it your responsibility to put this in the source code?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Mr. Barton, I did not put things in the

source code. I can tell you it's my understanding that that is boilerplate language that should not have been in this particular contract because there are the highest security standards are in place, and people have every right to expect privacy.

Mr. <u>Barton</u>. All right. Now, the last time we could check, this was still there. You're given almost unlimited authority under the Affordable Care Act to administer it. Will you commit to the committee and to the American people that, one, you do want to protect their privacy; and, two, you will take this out, fix it, make sure that it -- it doesn't have bearing on people that try to apply through the Web site?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir. And we have had those discussions with CGI, and it is under way. I do absolutely commit to protecting the privacy of the American public, and we have asked them to remove that statement. It is there in error, it needs to be taken down, and we should be held accountable for protecting privacy.

Mr. <u>Barton</u>. Well, thank you, Madam Secretary. I sincerely appreciate that, and I'm sure the American people do, too.

My last question, or it's really a comment. I've introduced H.R. 3348, which says let's make this system voluntary for the first year, since we're having so many problems, and let the American people decide. What that means is if people choose not to participate, they would not

be charged the penalty for nonparticipation.

Would you support such a reasonable approach to this while we work out the problems in the system?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, sir.

Mr. Barton. Okay. Well, that's an honest answer.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. <u>Barton</u>. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

The <u>Chairman.</u> Chair would recognize the gentleman from New Jersey Mr. Pallone.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know we're not in Kansas, but I do believe increasingly we're in Oz because of what I see here. So this "Wizard of Oz" comment by my colleague from Texas, I think, is particularly apropos given what we hear on the other side of the aisle.

I don't know how you keep your cool, Madam Secretary, you know, with this continuous effort on the part of the GOP to sabotage the ACA, to scare people, and bring up red herrings. And I think that this privacy issue is another red herring, and I'm going to ask you a question about that.

But before that I just wanted to say, this whole idea that's being brought up today that somehow, you know, policies are being canceled, and people don't have alternatives, it's just another red herring. You

know, what I think my colleagues on the other side forget is that this is not socialized medicine; this is, in fact, private insurance in a competitive market. And if I'm an insurance company, and all of a sudden everyone else is selling a better policy with better benefits at a lower price, I can't continue to sell a lousy skeletal policy that doesn't provide benefits and costs more because I'll be out of the market.

And so that's what's happening here. Insurance companies are canceling lousy policies with high prices because they can't compete, and that's what's going to happen when you have a private insurance market, which is what we have here. We don't have a government-controlled system; we have private markets. So I just wanted to make that point.

But I have to drill down on what Mr. Barton said here. You know, before reform, the individual insurance market was dysfunctional, premiums would shoot up if people got sick, their coverage could be canceled if they had a preexisting condition, and they did not have secure quality coverage. Now, I've heard my Republican colleagues say that patient health information will be at risk in this application process, and this is flat out false. In fact, the ACA makes a giant leap forward for protecting health information by taking it completely out of the insurance application process, by banning discrimination

based on preexisting conditions.

Mr. Barton, again, is, you know, raising this red herring, just like the cancellation of insurance, by talking about privacy. But, Madam Secretary, prior to the ACA, when people applied for insurance coverage, did insurers make them provide a long, detailed, and basic medical history, but now, because the law bans discrimination based on preexisting conditions, individuals will not have to have provide this information in their applications? So regardless of this clause, please comment on the privacy issue and why it's irrelevant.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, Mr. Pallone, in the past any individual American who was in an employer-based coverage, in government coverage like the ones we enjoy, in Medicare, in Medicaid, in the VA, a whole variety of plans, that's about 95 percent of insured Americans, had no medical underwriting, had group protections, had consumer protections. The people who were outside that consumer-protected space were individuals buying they own coverage in an individual market. Medical underwriting, demanding health records, and often going through extensive doctor interviews and getting health records was a standard for that market. Pricing could vary widely depending on gender, depending on health condition. People could be denied coverage, and were frequently.

That's the market that is currently being reformed with consumer

protections. If a person had a policy in place in March of 2010, liked that policy, and the insurance company made no changes to disadvantage the consumer, those policies are in place, you keep your plan, you like it, and that goes on.

For the people who, though, had a medically underwritten policy, were paying more than their neighbor because they happened to be female, could not get their health condition for a fixed hip written into their insurance plan, they will have a new day in a very competitive market. Twenty-five percent of the insurers are brand new to the market, and they are offering competitive plans.

Mr. <u>Pallone.</u> Mr. Chairman, could I just ask that this document --

The <u>Chairman.</u> Sure. Put it in the record. Without objection.

Mr. <u>Pallone.</u> Thank you.

[The information follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

The Chairman. The chair would recognize Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, I think Congresswoman Blackburn asked you about the Federal Government, how much they spent today, and they are spending some money as we speak, aren't they? It's down right now, isn't it? Are you -- you projected ongoing problems.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I'm sorry, sir. I'm having a hard time hearing. What was the --

Mr. <u>Hall</u>. She asked you how much it had spent today, and I'm asking what you expect to pay in addition to that on repairs that the Web site's going to require, and they're requiring them as we speak here. So those are things you projected, you knew they would happen, and they will happen. But you surely looked ahead, and you have some estimate of what is going to happen.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Hall</u>. And going to cost.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. For our two major contractors, who are QSSI, a subsidiary of United, and for CGI, there are obligated amounts. For CGI, who is in charge of the entire application, there has been \$197 million obligated, and that is to last through March of 2014. And as I said before, about \$104 million has been expended in that obligated amount.

Mr. <u>Hall</u>. I'm going try to be here in 2014 to be sure that your testimony is correct, okay?

I'm just -- I'm just joking with you.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Okay.

Mr. Hall. Were you born in Kansas? Meade, Kansas?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I was not. I was born in Cincinnati, Ohio.

I married a Kansan and went to Kansas.

Mr. <u>Hall.</u> All right. I was in third grade there, and I thought I saw you on a tricycle there one day.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, it was an illusion.

Mr. <u>Hall</u>. Let me ask you a question. Have you ever rejected a financial bill from one of the contractors? Have you ever?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Have I ever --

Mr. <u>Hall</u>. Rejected a financial bill from one of them.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, again, I -- our --

Mr. <u>Hall.</u> Well, I guess you can say yes or no.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Our accounting office does a routine audit and review of every bill that comes in before they do it. I do not personally. I want to be very accurate about I don't personally pay contracts, negotiate contracts. By law and by precedent, that's really illegal for someone who isn't a warranted contract officer to engage in the debate or discussion around Federal contracts.

```
Mr. <u>Hall</u>. How much has the administration spent on the exchanges in total; not just HealthCare.gov, but all of the exchanges?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I'm sure --

Mr. <u>Hall</u>. How difficult is that figure to give me or if you can't give --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I would like to get it to you in writing very quickly.

[The information follows:]
```

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Mr. <u>Hall.</u> Madam Secretary, I'd like to talk -- I don't know how much time I've got left, but I'd like to talk about a couple of businesses in my district who are struggling with how to move forward. One is a manufacturer, and one is in the pet boarding and training business. One has 85 employees, and the other has 56. Here's some quotes from some of their recent letters.

"The situation we're in is we would have to pay \$170,000 in penalties under Obamacare. This is another example of the government picking winners and losers. We are the losers. There's no way I can be competitive if I have to raise my prices to cover \$170,000. Here are my options: Do not pay the penalty, raise my prices, and go out of business, 85 people lose their jobs; lay off 35 employees who don't have to pay the penalty, and move more production to this country. Reduce 35 jobs."

And here's a quote from the other: "Since our high-labor, low-margin business cannot afford to pay for insurance for our employees, we're faced with either closing our business, perhaps through bankruptcy, so there are heavy financial obligations that would continue whether we operate or not; fire enough employees to get under 50 employees limits and close some of our business. Even if we close the location, we cannot escape many expenses such as rental agreements."

What am I supposed to tell these people?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, sir, I think that in the employer market, about 95 percent of all American businesses are exempt from any kind of requirement to cover employer-employee insurance, and they are outside the law. They continue to be outside the law. But they will have some new options for those who want to cover their employees, and some new tax credit possibilities.

For large employers, about 96 percent of them already cover their employees. And, as you know, the penalty that your constituents refer to is not a penalty that is imposed in 2014. It is being discussed with businesses about what kind of information is exchanged, and it will take place in 2015.

Mr. Hall. I thank the --

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Hall. He's going for use the gavel on me if you don't hush.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Hall. I yield back my time.

The <u>Chairman</u>. The chair would recognize the gentlelady from California Ms. Eshoo.

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome, Madam Secretary. You're a distinguished woman. You have distinguished yourself and your State, the offices that you've

held, and now working for the American people, and I salute you for it.

I want to really congratulate my Republican pals for being absolutely 1,000 percent consistent. You love what's wrong with the Web site, and you detest what's working in the Affordable Care Act. And I think that is on full display here.

But let's get back to the Web site, because that's what the hearing is about. It's my understanding that November 31st is the -- is a hard date for having everything up and running. Do you have -- now, HHS did testify in September that they were 100 percent confident that the site would be launched and fully functional on time on October 1st. That didn't work. Do you have full confidence in this new hard date?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Congresswoman, I can tell you that the assessment that we have made is that it will take until the end of November for an optimally functioning Web site. I know that the only way I can restore confidence that we get it right is to get it right. So I -- I have confidence, but I know that it isn't fair to ask the American people to take our word for it. I've got to fix this problem, and we are under way doing just that.

Ms. <u>Eshoo.</u> But are you confident that -- I think I said November 31st, which is --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I thought it was a trick question.

Ms. <u>Eshoo.</u> -- does not exist. But November 30th. You have confidence in November 30th?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I do.

Ms. <u>Eshoo</u>. Is there any penalty to QSSI or CGI for not delivering on what they promised?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I think the -- as you can see, we have a -- obligated funds for a contract. We certainly have not expended all these funds. And we expect not only the CMS team, but our contractor partners to fulfill their obligations and --

Ms. <u>Eshoo.</u> But if they fail to fulfill their obligations -- I don't know what's in the contract -- is there a penalty?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. There isn't a built-in penalty, but I can tell you that paying for work that isn't complete is not something that we will do.

QSSI, as you know, has taken on a new role as integrator. The hub that they built and have in operation is working extremely well not only for the Federal exchanges, but all the State-based markets are using the hub. And that's why we had confidence in their ability to actually take this next role on and coordinate the activities moving forward, which have to be driven with a very clear set of outcomes, very accountable timelines and deadlines, and they will be helping to manage that process.

Ms. <u>Eshoo</u>. On the issue of security, there was a security breach that arose recently, that I read about at any rate. And what I think is very important here, because the issue of privacy has been raised, and I think that that has been answered, because, very importantly, there isn't any health information in these systems, but there is financial information.

So my question to you is has a security wall been built, and are you confident that it is there, and that it will actually secure the financial information that applicants have to disclose?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, ma'am. I would tell you that there was not a breach. There was a blog by a sort of skilled hacker that if a certain series of incidents occurred, you could possibly get in and obtain somebody's personally identifiable --

Ms. <u>Eshoo</u>. But isn't that telling? Isn't that telling?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. And we immediately corrected that problem.

So there wasn't -- it was a theoretical problem that was immediately fixed.

I would tell you we are storing the minimum amount of data because we think that's very important. The hub is not a data collector. It is actually using data centers at the IRS, at Homeland Security, at Social Security to verify information, but it stores none of that data. So we --

Ms. <u>Eshoo.</u> Thank you.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> So we don't want to be --

RPTS HUMISTON

DCMN SECKMAN

[9:59 a.m.]

The Chairman. The gentlelady's time has expired.

The chair recognizes Mr. Shimkus.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome, Madam Secretary.

Madam Secretary, before I start my questions, the Washington Post gave the administration and the President, yourself, four Pinocchios on this whole debate of if you like the insurance you have, you can keep it. Would you recommend to the president that he stop using that term? Wouldn't that be helpful in this debate?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Well, sir, I think he used the term at the time that the law was passed, and he continued to say --

Mr. Shimkus. And as of September 26th also, so --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That is why we wrote the grandfather --

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. So the answer is you don't buy -- you don't believe that The Washington Post, and therefore --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I haven't read The Washington Post.

Mr. Shimkus. Well, we'll hand this down to you --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Thank you.

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. -- so you can see it. Have you ever shopped, I know you have, but this is -- for a -- at a grocery store with a coupon?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes.

Mr. <u>Shimkus.</u> Have you ever used a coupon? Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Yes.

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. So the coupon gives you the terms and conditions of when you go to the checkout to -- to get whatever is off the price of the goods. When you all added the "See Plans Now" option, you, in essence, gave the searcher, in essence, a coupon based upon what they're seeing there. The desire was, let people know what the price is; however, as the news reported, and I followed up in last week's hearing, was that if you are under 50 years old, you get quoted the price of someone who is 27. If you are older than 50 -- if you are older than 50, could be 64, you get quoted a price of someone who is 50 years old. Isn't that misleading?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Well, sir, the learn side of the Web site, which has been up since actually late 20 --

Mr. <u>Shimkus.</u> So that is truthful, then? If you quote a price -Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> It is clearly a hypothetical situation that
allows people --

Mr. <u>Shimkus.</u> Oh, so you --Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- to --

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. Okay. On the "See Plans Now" option, are you saying this is a hypothetical? That is not what it says on the site. It says this is the price when you put in your age. And if your age is 49, it quotes you as if you are 27.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, the only way someone can get an accurate information about their price is to get their individual --

Mr. Shimkus. Let me ask you another --

Secretary Sebelius. -- eligibility determined.

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. When did you decide to use this below 50 at 27 and above 50 at 50 years old? When did you make that decision?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That was decided by the team as we put up -- Mr. Shimkus. By who? Who made the --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I will get you that information.

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. The problem with the whole debate is you all won't tell us who made the decision.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I can tell you I did not design the site.

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. So who?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I will get the --

Mr. <u>Shimkus.</u> Well, who I made the decision on the 27 year old quote for someone who is 50?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I just said I will get you that information, sir.

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. Thank you. Let me go to -- because it is misleading, and the White House insists it didn't mislead the public, and of course, we find out that you did. Let me finish on this debate. It is another transparency issue. If someone, a constituent of mine or someone in this country, has strongly held pro life views --

Voice. Oh, here we go.

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. -- can you commit to us to make sure that the Federal exchanges that offer that is clearly identified and so people can understand if they are going to buy a policy that has abortion coverage or not? Because right now, you cannot make that determination.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, I -- I don't know. I -- I know exactly the -- the issue you're talking about. I will check and make sure --

Mr. Shimkus. Here's -- here's --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- that that --

Mr. Shimkus. Okay. Thank you.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- is clearly identifiable.

Mr. Shimkus. Well, here's --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. You're saying --

Mr. <u>Shimkus</u>. Here's our request. Can you provide for the committee the list of insurers in the Federal exchange who do not offer as part of their package abortion coverage?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I think we can do that, sir.

Mr. Shimkus. Well, you should be able to do it.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I --

Mr. Shimkus. So --

Secretary Sebelius. I just said --

Mr. Shimkus. No. You said if we can do it.

Secretary Sebelius. No. I think we can do that, is what I said.

Mr. Shimkus. I think or I know we can do it?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, I can't tell you what I don't know firmly right now. I know that is the plan. I will get that information to you. I --

The <u>Chairman.</u> Gentleman's time has expired.

The chair recognizes Mr. Engel from New York.

Mr. Engel. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, I appreciate your coming today to answer questions about the Affordable Healthcare Act.

You know, my Republican colleagues' actions here remind me a story I read when I was a little boy, and that is the story of Chicken Little, who ran around yelling, "The sky is falling. The sky is falling," but unlike Chicken Little, my Republican colleagues are actually rooting for the sky to fall.

Republicans are holding this hearing today under the auspices of an investigative hearing, as if they want to get to the bottom of what

went wrong with the Web site in order to help fix it.

But I don't think, Madam Secretary, there's one person in this room who is naive enough to actually think that the Republicans want to see this law work. They voted over 40 times to repeal the law. They shut down the government and threatened to force a default in order to stop it. They're rooting for failure.

Madam Secretary, can you tell us what would be the impact on Americans' health insurance if Republicans had been successful in their efforts to defund or repeal the Affordable Care Act?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I think that the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office is that would have increased the deficit by about \$110 billion in the first decade and close to a trillion dollars in the second decade. We know that we have 42 or 43 million Americans without health insurance at all, some of them Medicaid eligible and some in the -- over the Medicaid eligibility. Thirty governors so far, Republicans and Democrats, have declared their support for moving ahead with Medicaid expansion, but absent that, the Affordable Care Act, those folks would be without any kind of health security.

And in the private market, what we know is it takes a real toll, but I'd say the biggest issue is not just the financial toll, not the community toll, not the country toll, which is significant. I have

a good friend who runs the cancer center at the University of Kansas. I was with him and cancer researchers recently, and he said that if you get a cancer diagnosis, you are 60 percent more likely to live 5 years and beyond if you have insurance than if you don't. I think that's a pretty powerful statement for why we need affordable healthcare for all of our citizens.

Mr. <u>Engel.</u> Well, thank you. The Republicans have not been able to defund or repeal it, but they have denied requested funding. They've raised specious arguments about death panels and socialized medicine. And they've worked to intimidate groups that could help the implementation effort. There is the spreading of misinformation about the cost of coverage, we hear some of that today, and to actively dissuade the uninsured from seeking coverage.

So, Madam Secretary, how have these tactics impacted your ability to implement the Affordable Care Act?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I don't think there's any question that a lot of people need a lot of information. I think it's one of the reasons we had millions visit the site, try to visit the site. It's why I am so frustrated and disappointed that the site is not fully functional and why I'm so committed to getting it functional, because clearly there is a demand. We need to get information to people about the law. This is the law. This is not any longer a debate. It was

a law passed by both Houses of Congress, signed by the President of the United States, upheld by the Supreme Court. The president was reelected. It is the law, and people have benefits and rights under that law, and we've got to get that information so they can make good choices for themselves and their families.

Mr. <u>Engel.</u> Well, thank you. It is the law, and frankly, I find it disconcerting that my Republican colleagues have done nothing but root for this law to fail for the last 3 and a half years, and now there's a big show here of being upset at problems with the Web site, of keeping people from signing up for coverage fast enough.

So I would just say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you're really on the wrong side of history here. The Web site will be fixed and millions of Americans will be able to get quality affordable health insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act.

And, again, I thank you for being here today, Madam -- Madam.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Mr. Pitts, chairman of the Health Committee.

Mr. <u>Pitts</u>. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Madam Secretary.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Mr. Pitts.

Mr. <u>Pitts.</u> Have you personally tried to register or enroll on the Web site?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, I created an early lite account so I would see the prompts that were coming to people who were interested.

I did work my way to the application feature fairly early on, but frankly, I -- I have affordable healthcare, so I didn't try the eligibility.

Mr. <u>Pitts.</u> No. I just wondered if you'd been through the process that millions of Americans are having to go through.

Madam Secretary, the -- the initial Web site crashes appear that be largely a result of the decision to prevent browsing of the plans. CGI Federal testified at our hearing last week that they had designed the Web site to allow users to browse and compare plans before having to create an account. Ms. Campbell told us that 2 weeks prior to the October 1st launch, they were told to turn off the browsing feature. Were you aware in September that this decision was made?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, I wasn't aware of that particular decision. That was made by the CMS team. I was aware that we were paring back some features to not put additional risk on the Web site. It seems --

Mr. Pitts. And who made that decision?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- ironic at this point.

Mr. Pitts. Who made that decision?

Secretary Sebelius. Administrator Tavenner made that decision.

Mr. Pitts. And do you know why that was made?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir. Because we were anxious to get

the Web site up and running and functional, which we clearly have failed to do to date, although I would suggest the Web site has never crashed. It is functional but at a very slow speed and very low reliability and has continued to function.

Having said that, they pared down some of the features, feeling that it would be better to load them in later. One was the shop-and-browse feature, another was the Spanish version of the Web site, and the Medicaid transfers. All three of those issues --

Mr. Pitts. All right.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- were pared down in September --

Mr. Pitts. Thank you.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- to not load the system.

Mr. Pitts. Thank you.

Last week, CGI Federal and QSSI testified that CMS was responsible for end-to-end testing and that they believed that months of testing would have been preferable to 2 weeks. Do you believe that 2 weeks was enough time to complete testing of the entire system?

Secretary Sebelius. Clearly not.

Mr. <u>Pitts.</u> And when were you made aware of the result of the test, including the one where the system collapsed with only a few hundred users?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, leading up to the October 1st date, we

had regular meetings with not only a team at CMS but administrators involved. I was made aware that we were testing, and as we found problems, we were fixing those problems. And I think there is a CGI report at mid-August identifying some problems. And between August and October, that became the punch list for CGI to fix those problems. That's why you test.

Mr. <u>Pitts.</u> Now, in the Washington Post, on October 21st, there was an article that said about a month before the exchange opened, a testing group of 10 insurers urged agency officials not to launch the site, because it was riddled with problems. Were you aware in September that insurers recommended a delay in the launch of the exchange?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I was not aware that they recommended delay. I know everyone was concerned that there were risks and there were likely to be problems with a brand new integrated insurance system. I don't think anyone ever estimated the degree to which we've had problems in the system, and certainly the contracting partners did not.

Mr. <u>Pitts.</u> And did HHS respond to the insurers' recommendation to delay the launch?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, I can't -- I wasn't in the meeting. I don't know what occurred in the meeting --

Mr. Pitts. Can you find out --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- and I don't know who they talked to.

Mr. Pitts. -- and answer that question for us?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sure. I will get back to you.

Mr. <u>Pitts.</u> Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Mr. Green.

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, thank you for taking time to be here today. I represent parts of eastern north Houston, Harris County, and our district has one of the highest uninsured rates in the country. Even worse, we have one of the highest rates of people who have jobs but don't receive their insurance through their employer. It's for this reason that I believe Houston would be a good place for you to come and spend -- spread the word about the tremendous benefits of the Affordable Care Act, however, we learned your offices -- you're unable to attend because of scheduling conflicts. And hopefully we can have an agreement that sometime in the future you will come to the fourth largest city that probably has the highest number of uninsured in a metropolitan area. And, of course, we're in the State of the Texas, that has the highest uninsured in the country.

The -- it's important to me and our constituents to get it right, and that's why I share your and the President's disappointment the Web

site is not working as planned. November 30th is not soon enough. Many of my constituents have been waiting for years to be able to purchase health insurance, and we owe it to them to get the marketplaces up and running. The contractors have not served our country well and should fix it or not be paid.

Now we're hearing about the cancellation letters being sent by insurance companies to their customers notifying them that their plans are no longer offered.

Are these Americans losing their healthcare coverage because of the Affordable Care Act, or is it because these plans were changed after the enactment of the act?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I would say it's the latter, sir. If a plan was in place since the enactment of the act, no one would have received a cancellation letter.

Mr. <u>Green.</u> So if somebody in America had an insurance plan before the act -- and the President was correct, if you have what you -- if you like what you have, you could keep it.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Green.</u> The plans were changed, and so now they have to comply with the new law.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. They could either choose to be grandfathered and keep the same plan, which meant the same benefits.

And actually the regulation allows insurance companies to charge medical inflation, plus the trend line, so they didn't have to charge the same price; they could increase it. They could increase copays, they could increase coinsurance. What they couldn't do is cancel benefits that the policyholder relied on, they couldn't disadvantage the policyholder. But if that plan is in effect, absolutely, it is still in effect.

Mr. <u>Green.</u> Okay. But some of these millions of letters we're hearing about are probably because their plans changed after --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Well, absolutely. And, again, in the individual market, plans change every year.

Mr. Green. Yeah.

Secretary Sebelius. Insurers design new products.

Mr. Green. Even in the small business market, that happens.

These plans are not allowed now because they're completely inadequate; they don't offer the minimum essential benefits. Is that correct.

Secretary Sebelius. That is correct.

Mr. <u>Green.</u> Okay. And having been a State legislator, and I know as Governor of Kansas, I assume every State has some type of minimum mandated benefits that they have for their health insurance plans.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. They do, but it applies, again, sir, in the

past usually to the group markets, where 90 percent of

American -- covered Americans get their policies. This market has

always been the Wild West.

Mr. <u>Green</u>. Okay.

Secretary Sebelius. They didn't have protections.

Mr. <u>Green.</u> The Americans who received those letters from their companies about cancellations, they're eligible to purchase plans on the exchange?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Or out of the exchange. Individuals who don't -- aren't interested in some kind of financial help can go outside the exchange, inside the exchange. Their insurer can offer them plans. They have choices they've never had before.

Mr. <u>Green.</u> And because of the benefits of the Affordable Care Act, 80 percent of their premium dollar will come back to them.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's correct.

Mr. <u>Green</u>. Okay.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's correct.

Mr. <u>Green.</u> And that's not true. And I know -- I know it's not true in Texas, but I don't know what -- any States that have that 80 percent requirement.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Well, no State had it, I would suggest, in that kind of broad base prior to the Affordable Care Act. So it's an

80/20 --

Mr. <u>Green.</u> Let me give you an example of one of the plans I found out during case work a few years ago. A large company provided \$25,000 maximum benefit for their employees in the year. Most of employees didn't know about it, and -- until this one constituent found out that she had cancer, and the bill ended up being \$300,000. And so that's some of those plans that are not being allowed to be sold now. Is that correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, not only would the plan have a limit on out-of-pocket cost for year, it will have a limit on a lifetime out-of-pocket cost, and it will have -- it will take away the notion that you would you would run out of your coverage in the middle of a treatment, which a lot of plans do.

Mr. <u>Green.</u> I know I'm out of my time, but it's like buying a car. It may look good, but if it doesn't have a motor, it's no good to have that car. So that's why the Affordable Care Act has --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. You save a lot of gas, but it doesn't get you anywhere.

The <u>Chairman.</u> The gentleman's time has expired.

The gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Walden.

Mr. Walden. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Governor, Secretary, we're delighted to have you before the

committee. You and I both know how important this issue is to all Americans that we get it right. So I hope you can appreciate we're trying to understand what we missed along the way, and one of the things that bothered me was the letter that was sent from your agency to the GAO back in June 6th. And I'll read in part, it said, "We're in the final stages of finalizing and testing the IT infrastructure that will support the application enrollment process. HHS is extremely confident that, on October 1, the marketplace will open on schedule and millions of Americans will have access to affordable, quality health insurance."

I'm just an average guy from a small town in Oregon. When I read that, it tells me you believed everything was good to go, the testing was in place and we should have full confidence everything would work. Correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's the letter I signed, yes, sir.

Mr. Walden. Yeah. Actually --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Or whoever.

Mr. <u>Walden.</u> -- it was signed by your assistant.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes.

Mr. <u>Walden.</u> But --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes.

Mr. <u>Walden.</u> -- the same point. And so I went into this believing

in your response, your agency's response to GAO that things were ready to go, we should have full confidence, because when somebody uses the word "extremely confident," it tells me you're extremely confident.

Second piece. Then when we had the testimony from the witnesses last week, I asked them about the end-to-end testing and what the industry standard would be, and they said it really should have been months, especially for a project of this magnitude, and yet we heard it was only 2 weeks. Now, in August, GCI told CMS in their report -- Secretary Sebelius. CGI.

Mr. <u>Walden.</u> I'm sorry. CGI. Thank you. On August 9th, that there was not enough time in the schedule to conduct adequate performance testing. Did that make its way all the way to you, and do you think there was adequate time?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, clearly, as I've said before, we did not adequately do end-to-end testing. The products were not locked and loaded into the system until the third week in September. Each of the component parts --

Mr. <u>Walden.</u> Right. They --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- was tested --

Mr. $\underline{\text{Walden.}}$ They told us that.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- validated, independently validated --

Mr. <u>Walden.</u> And so all of those --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- but end-to-end --

Mr. <u>Walden</u>. I'm sorry. All those worked, though, right? They told us last week that their individual modules were tested and met specification. Do you concur with that analysis, based on what you know?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I do concur with the testing that was done, ves.

Mr. <u>Walden</u>. Okay. So it really was the end-to-end, which is why some of us thought we should delay until it could be done right, to avoid this very collapse that now is upon us. And I realize not everybody agreed to that.

The second piece here gets back to the Washington Post, which I realize you haven't had, and I understand, a chance to read this morning, but the four Pinocchios about the President repeatedly saying if you have a plan, you will keep a plan. We all heard that to mean, I've got a plan with a company, I'll continue to have it even if they make minor changes, when in fact your own rules as written said, no, that really isn't what's going to happen. If minor changes are made, that means the plan changed; that means you don't get it.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, sir, that isn't true. The rules did not say what you just suggested. And I think the estimate given that there would be turnover in the market was really an outside projection.

It wasn't our rules. It was a snapshot of what happens in the market, that plans change so --

Mr. Walden. Sure.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- dramatically --

Mr. Walden. Every year.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- over time, that the estimate was they wouldn't be -- not because of our rules, but because of insurance companies' business decisions --

Mr. Walden. Well, but you set up --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- marketing plans.

Mr. <u>Walden.</u> -- what those market rules looked like they have to comply with, correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Only if they chose not to grandfather the policy. That's the --

Mr. Walden. But that meant they couldn't make any changes.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Any grandfathered polices stayed in place still would be in place --

Mr. Walden. Right. But not if they made --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. None of these rules apply.

Mr. <u>Walden.</u> But if they made any change --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> No. They could make changes in pricing.

They could make changes in benefits. They couldn't dramatically

disadvantage the consumer, but they could have trend lines.

They -- they had a wide corridor to make sure that the -- a similar plan -- so if a consumer liked the plan, the plan, if it stayed in place --

Mr. <u>Walden</u>. So here's what -- the practical implication, I've got letters from constituents all over my district who have gotten letters from their insurers who say because of Obamacare, they're no longer going to be in the individual market, or at least with that plan in the individual market. And the result is this person from Cove, Oregon, said, I was paying \$600 a month for a \$3,000 deductible. Now it costs me \$800 a month for a \$5,000 deductible. I've got others here I'll put in the record. A woman whose job, she had 40 hours, now down to 29, neither has health insurance nor enough income to live on her own because of the way this law is getting implemented.

I realize my time's expired.

[The information follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

The Chairman. The gentlelady from Colorado, Ms. DeGette.

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Secretary, for being with us today.

I want to follow up on a couple of those questions that Mr. Walden was asking you about CGI. As you know, Chairman Issa last night released this document, a monthly project status report from CGI last night. It looks to me it's sort of a technical document that has a punch list of outstanding open issues, and some of them do highlight items that upon first read seem to be alarming. For example, one of the entries that, due to the compressed schedule, there's not enough time built in to allow for adequate performance testing. And this certainly in retrospect sounds bad, but the day of the document that Chairman Issa released is September 6th. And then, on September 10th, 4 days later, CGI came in to this committee and testified under oath, quote, "CGI Federal is confident it will" develop -- "deliver the functionality that CMS has directed." And -- and we're -- we're trying to figure out, or at least I'm trying to figure out how CGI is now coming in and saying, you know, we warned everybody that this wasn't going to be ready, when they came in and directly told me that they would be ready to launch on October 1st.

So it kind of raises the question how these statements can be reconciled. One explanation is that CGI was lying to this committee.

I think that's unlikely. Another is that CGI thought that the items flagged in the report were like a punch list that could be addressed.

So here's my question to you, Madam Secretary. Was CGI telling your department the same thing that they told the committee on September 10th, that the company was confident that its programs would be ready?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Congresswoman, all of the contractors testified here in September and again, I think, last week before this committee, and the testimony was fairly similar, that they were ready to go in September. They were asked in -- last week if they had suggested that we should delay the launch date. Each of them said no. I think the chairman asked those questions.

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. So they never asked you to delay the launch date? Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. They did not. And, frankly, I -- I think it is not valuable at this point --

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. Right.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- to do a lot of pointing blame, fixing the blame. What I want to do is fix the problem.

Ms. DeGette. And -- and so do I.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I think we need the whole team to move ahead --

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. But --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- and we will report back regularly.

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. Right. But we're relying on these contractors -
Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I understand.

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. -- to fix this. And so that goes to my last question, which is, Mr. Zients has now come in, and he says the site is going to be functional for the vast majority of users by the end of November. Is that right?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's correct.

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. And given what CGI told us, and the other vendors, do you believe that that is correct? Do you believe it will be pretty much ready to go by the end of November?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I do. And I think that we are making improvements each and every day. It is easier to use now than it was 2 weeks ago. It is way from where we need it to be --

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. So it's not like it's all going to be fine by the end of November. It's beginning to improve already. Is that your testimony?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. It is a continuous process, as Web sites are. Patches are made, fixes are made on an ongoing basis.

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. Thank you.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> And as we find issues, like Congresswoman Eshoo talked about, we are fixing them in real-time.

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. And you're going to guarantee, yes or no, that people will have privacy when they go on this site?

Secretary Sebelius. Absolutely.

Ms. <u>DeGette</u>. Now, I just want to say one last thing. I was on the Washington Journal program where callers call in this morning, and I had a man, Max, call in, and he said he got one of those letters from the insurance companies that his insurance was cancelled, so what he did is he went onto the Web site and he -- under the Federal exchange, and he found a better plan, and now he's going to sign up. So I would hope that that's what everybody would be able to do.

And I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The <u>Chairman.</u> Mr. Terry.

Mr. Terry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I'm pleased to hear that the Web site will be fully operational by the end of November. And would you be able to -- would you come back to our committee so we could see if that's actually accomplished and how it was accomplished?

Secretary Sebelius. I -- I will make every effort to do that.

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> Okay. You were Governor and State insurance commissioner in Kansas. And I reached out to our State insurance commissioner and Governor and found out that they have absolutely no data about Nebraskans who have either tried to enroll or enroll. As

you know, Nebraska is one of the States that opted not to do their own exchange and rely on the Federal exchange. So it's interesting to me that neither our insurance commissioner nor the Governor's office had any data about Nebraskans and this -- this -- and enrolling in these plans.

I also asked our insurance commissioner if any of the navigators -- if they knew who the navigators were and whether they had to apply to be certified or licensed, in essence like an insurance agent would be. And they told me they have no clue who's been authorized by HHS to be a navigator and work with people in Nebraska. So this is concerning to me, so I'm going to ask you a few questions along this line.

First of all, do you have data on how many people in general in the United States have tried to enroll in a plan through this Web site?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, sir. We do not have any reliable data around enrollment, which is why we haven't given it to date.

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> All right. Or have any data on how many people have tried to enroll but, because of the problems, have not been able to accomplish that?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, sir. I can tell you I met with insurers last week, and one of the priority fixes is the so-called 834s, the document that --

```
Mr. <u>Terry.</u> Okay.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- sends an individual's name --

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> The --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- to a company and verifies it.

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> But --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> That is one of the systems that is not working.
```

DCMN ROSEN

Mr. <u>Terry</u>. I appreciate that. And the contractors I asked specifically about the information of how many people have tried to enroll and enroll, and they say that they do have those numbers, but can't tell us that because of a contract with HHS saying that they -- they're gagged on that information.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I would suggest --

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> So could I --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- that the numbers are not reliable according to the --

Mr. Terry. Well, I tell you what --

Secretary Sebelius. -- insurance agents and according to us.

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> What my question is going to be, though, will you, on the record right now, authorize them to give us those numbers and let us determine whether those are reliable?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> No, sir. I want to give you --

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> All right.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- reliable, confirmed data from every

State and from the Federal marketplace. We have said that we will do

that on a monthly basis by the middle --

Mr. <u>Terry</u>. So --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- of the month. You will have that data, but I don't want to turn over anything that is not confirmed and reliable, and that's what we'll do.

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> Well, but that data out there exists, and --Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, I would --

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> -- you will not let us have it now.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I would tell you right now it is not reliable data. According to the insurance companies who are eager --

Mr. Terry. Well, the --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- to have customers, they are not --

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> I --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- getting reliable data all the way through the system.

Mr. <u>Terry</u>. The number of people --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> It's one of the real problems that we have.

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> -- that have clicked on and tried to get it or enrolled, I'm not asking about what they enrolled in or whether they came in and said they were 65 and were quoted something that they were 27 years old. That should be a pretty reliable number just --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. The system --

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> -- on the surface, so would you --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- isn't functioning, so we are not getting

that reliable data. Insurers --

Mr. <u>Terry</u>. All right.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- who I met with said that is the case.

We know that there's 700,000 applications that have been --

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> The reliability of that data certainly flies in the face of the testimony from the contractors.

All right. I yield back.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Ms. Capps.

Mrs. <u>Capps.</u> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Secretary Sebelius, for your presence here today and your testimony.

While I, too, am frustrated with the flawed rollout of
HealthCare.gov, I do appreciate your longstanding commitment to
improving the health care options for all Americans and in fixing this
Web site quickly.

I think it's important to note that in my home State of California and other States as well, the new exchange marketplace, we call it Covered California, is working. And rates, constituents are finding that rates are as much as 29 percent less than those that they found on the marketplace last year. I'm thankful my constituents now have this option.

And as I look around to implementation nationwide, it seems clear to me that political decisions in individual States have really made

the difference for consumers. The governors and legislators, State legislators that embraced this law are delivering for their communities, but those elected who are trying to ignore the opportunities presented and continue to throw up roadblocks both here in Congress and in State legislators should not now seem surprised that there are significant bumps along the way.

This seems to me to be completely disingenuous. Having embraced the law since open enrollment began October 1st, Californians have started nearly 180,000 applications, with more beginning every day.

I know my time is limited, but I want to have a second to mention a conversation I had just last night with a telephone town hall to my district on the central coast of California. One of the first callers I heard from was a mother from Santa Barbara, her name's Meryl, and she wanted to tell me the story of her son. Her son is 28 years old and he had been paying \$425 a month for his insurance before the Affordable Care Act. She was happy to report that he has already applied through Covered California and has found a policy that works better for him and has all the essential health benefits covered, which his former policy did not, and now will only cost him \$109 a month. This is significant savings for Meryl's son, and this is a story that's being repeated at least in California often.

So there are millions of residents in many States who have now

set up their own Web sites and marketplaces. In those States, tens of thousands of people are now as we speak signing up for coverage, and this is demonstrating that the Affordable Care Act is working.

In New York and Washington, over 30,000 people have enrolled; in Oregon, over 50,000 people have been enrolled; Kentucky, 31,000 people have been enrolled. We could go on and on. The success of the State exchanges, which is where this is meant to be implemented, shows how badly this law is wanted and needed, how much it will be of help to so many people who want quality, affordable health care.

So my three quick questions to you are this, Madam Speaker: What is your assessment of how this first month have been gone -- has gone in the States that are running their own marketplaces, which this Congress intended that the Affordable Care Act work?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, everything we hear from the State-based markets is that they are doing well. They have not submitted data yet. We, again, are working with them around a monthly schedule so that they will confirm Medicaid data and enrollment data, and we'll see the real numbers at the end of the month and make sure that the -- they're available to the public, but everything we hear is that they see the same demand, they are eager to enroll folks, and that that is going smoothly.

Mrs. <u>Capps.</u> And what do you think this success shows about the

demand and the interest for affordable health insurance on the part of constituents?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I don't think there's any question that in spite of a series of roadblocks and blockades and a lot of misinformation driven by about a \$400 million marketing campaign last year, Americans are eager to see what their benefits may be under the law, what their opportunities are, how to get health security for themselves and their families. And we want to make sure that they see those benefits. The Web site is one of the ways to do that. The call center, on-the-ground enrollment, personal outreach are a variety of ways.

And I would tell your colleague, Mr. Congressman, I'd be happy to get you the list of the Nebraska folks who are on the ground. It's available easily. It's public record. So I'd be happy to send it to you so you can share it with your insurance commissioner and governor.

Mr. <u>Terry.</u> Thank you.

The <u>Chairman.</u> The gentlelady's time is expired. The gentleman from the great State of Michigan, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> Thank you. I thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here. A short time, I'll get through some questions here if I can.

Is it your testimony that the -- that there -- every night to try to increase the functionality of the system, you're -- you're hot

swapping codes? So my understanding is that between 2 and 4, write new code, put it into the system. Yes or no?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Clearly I am not hot swapping code. There is a --

Mr. Rogers. No, no.

Secretary Sebelius. -- technical team that periodically --

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> You're in charge of the operation that hot swaps code on functionality. Is that -- you're trying improve the functionality. Yes?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes.

Mr. <u>Rogers</u>. So that happens every night. Yes?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No. I don't think it does happen every night. It happens periodically during the hours of 1:00 and 5:00, but it is not a nightly feature.

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> Great. Has each piece of that code that's been introduced into the system been security tested?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> That's my understanding, yes, sir. And the --

Mr. Rogers. Each --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- testing --

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> Each piece of that code has been tested. Yes or no? Secretary Sebelius. I could not -- I don't know --

Mr. Rogers. Okay. That's a --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- but I can tell you that security --

Mr. Rogers. That's a much safer answer, trust me.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- is an ongoing operation, that as code is loaded, you need to retest over and over again. So whether it's pre-tested, I can't tell you.

Mr. Rogers. All right.

Secretary Sebelius. I know --

Mr. Rogers. You need to pre-test the code.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- it is simultaneous --

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> Has any end-to-end security tests been conducted since HealthCare.gov went live on October 1st, yes or no?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. My understanding is there is continuous testing as the temporary authority to operate calls for.

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> Yes or no, has an end-to-end security test on HealthCare.gov went live, yes or no?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I will find out exactly what testing they're doing. I know they're doing simultaneous testing as new code is loaded.

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> Are there any end-to-end security tests run after every new piece of code is put in -- I'm not talking about testing the code now. I'm talking about an end-to-end security test --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I can tell you how -Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> -- that covers across the boundaries.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- frequently it's done --

Mr. Rogers. Well, I can tell --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- but I will get you that information from my techs.

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> I can tell you they're not, and I'd be interested to hear why not.

Tab -- if you'd go to Tab 2 quickly in your book, I'm going to read three things --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I'm sorry. What book, sir?

Mr. Rogers. You have to tab there that if you go to --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I --

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> -- Tab 2, right there -- well, while you're looking, I'll read. It's dated September 27th and it is to Marilyn Tavenner. Let me just read a couple of pieces here. There are inherent security risks with not having all code tested in a single environment. Finally, the system requires rapid development and release of hot fixes and patches, so it is not always available or stable during the duration of the testing.

Secondly, the security contractor has not been able to test all of the security controls in one complete version of the system.

And if you look in the first part, which is most troubling of all, it says, due to system readiness issues, the security control assessment was only partly completed. This constitutes a risk that must be accepted before the marketplace day one operations.

And so let me tell you what you did. You allowed the system to go forward with no encryption on backup systems. They had no encryption on certain boundary crossings. You accepted a risk on behalf of every user of this computer that put their personal financial information at risk because you did not even have the most basic end-to-end tests on security of this system.

Amazon would never do this, ProFlowers would never do this, Kayak would never do this. This is completely an unacceptable level of security. And here's the scary part: We found out after the contractors last week that an end-to-end test hadn't been conducted on security, not functionality, because if it's not functioning, you know it's not secure. You are ongoing hot patches without end-to-end tests. The private contractors told us it would take a very thorough 2 months just for an integrated end-to-end security test that I'll tell you has not happened today. Why? Because you're constantly adding new code every night to protect the functionality of the system. You have exposed millions of Americans because you all, according to your memo, believed it was an acceptable risk. Don't you think you had the

obligation to tell the American people that we're going to put you in the system, but you -- beware, your information is likely to be vulnerable? Would you commit today, Secretary, to shut down the system and give an end-to-end security test so that these Americans --

Secretary Sebelius. No, sir.

Mr. Rogers. -- could have their information?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. If you read the memo --

Mr. Rogers. Oh, I have read it.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- it goes on to say that weekly testing of our Brda devices, including interface testing, daily, weekly scans are going on. This is a temporary authority --

Mr. Rogers. Candidly, that's not what the memo says --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- a temporary --

Mr. Rogers. -- number one --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. It does.

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> -- and number two, the contractors will tell you this is --

Mr. Waxman. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The Chairman. The gentleman ---

Mr. <u>Waxman.</u> I think the witness ought to be allowed to answer what was a speech by the colleague, because he's raised a lot of issues.

The Chairman. If the gentlelady will answer, we'll move ---

Mr. Rogers. You mean there's --

The Chairman. -- we'll move --

Mr. Rogers. -- giving speeches here today? That's shocking.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Does the Secretary wish to respond briefly?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, I would just say this document is a document signed by Administrator Tavenner which discusses mitigation strategies for security that are ongoing and upgraded, and an authorization to operate on a permanent basis will not be signed until these mitigation strategies are satisfied. It is underway right now, but daily and weekly monitoring and testing is underway.

Mr. <u>Rogers.</u> Mr. Chairman, there are people using this system today, and she's just admitted again the system isn't secure nor has it been --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I did not say that, sir.

Mr. <u>Waxman.</u> Mr. Chairman, she didn't admit that. You said it, but she didn't say it.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time is expired, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. <u>Doyle</u>. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, welcome. Those of us who fought for this law, who voted for this law have a vested interest in its success, and -- and the concerns that you hear expressed on this side of the panel are real, because we want to see Americans get health care. I think it's somewhat disingenuous for my colleagues

on the other side of the -- the podium here to have this faux anger and this faux concern over a bill that they absolutely want to fail and have rooted for its failure and have voted over 40-some times to repeal this bill, never putting an alternative plan on the floor for the American people, but just to simply say they want to make sure this plan doesn't succeed.

And I think their real -- real fear is, is that the plan will succeed and the American people will learn of the real benefits of this plan, not the propaganda campaign that's gone on by the Republicans for the last 3 years.

Madam Secretary, I think one of the keys to the success of this plan is that we get young people to enroll in this plan, and I have some questions about some enrollment concerns that I have. Now, I understand that -- that you've said approximately 700,000 people have applied for coverage via the HealthCare.gov and the State exchanges. Is that -- is that --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> They've completed an application.

Mr. <u>Doyle.</u> Right. Which is different from enrollment.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's correct.

Mr. <u>Doyle.</u> So my question is, are you expecting -- I know you don't have exact numbers yet, but are you expecting a large number or a small number of enrollments during the first month? What -- what

is your thoughts on that?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, our projections prior to launch were always that there would be a very small number at the beginning. We watched the Massachusetts trend, which started slowly and built. I think there's no question that given our flawed launch of HealthCare.gov, it will be a very small number.

Mr. <u>Doyle</u>. Yeah. I mean, in the Massachusetts plan, I think the first month, it was 123 people signed up, less than -- than 1 percent of the overall first year enrollment in that first month. And we saw the same kind of numbers in Medicare Part D the first month of open enrollment back in 2006.

Madam Secretary, young Americans are the most likely age group to be uninsured, and a lot of us are concerned that because of the problems that we've been having with the Web site, that a lot of these young folks may not come back on. You know, they have very short attention spans. I've got four kids that all work on the Internet, and if they can't get something in 5 minutes, they're on to something else.

What do we do and what plans are in place by your department to encourage young people to go back and revisit that site and to make sure that we're getting young people looking at that site and accessing it?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, step number one is fix the site, because we don't want people to be invited back and then have a bad experience a second time around. I think that's absolutely right. The site is particularly important to tech savvy younger generation folks, who we need to enroll. I think that we have -- so fixing the site is step one, and step number two is getting information to folks that the law even exists. A lot of young people haven't followed this dialogue for the last 3-1/2 years or been paying attention --

Mr. Doyle. Yeah. I -- I think we need a real --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- and think they don't need health insurance.

Mr. <u>Doyle.</u> -- a real marketing campaign and we need to really reach out to --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes.

Mr. Doyle. -- young people --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. We intend do that.

Mr. <u>Doyle.</u> -- especially at the end of November, when you say this site is going to be working a lot better, to make sure they're checking that site out.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. You bet.

Mr. <u>Doyle</u>. One of my four kids is self-employed. He's 33 years old. He's paying about \$140 a month right now for a Blue Cross plan.

He's eligible for a subsidy. We browsed that site. He's going to be able to get coverage for about half of what he's paying right now. And that's good news for us, because I think my wife is paying his premiums, so I think we're going to save the money.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I would --

Mr. <u>Doyle</u>. But I think it's important -- we had to prod him to go on that site and enroll. And I think for a lot of young people, they're not going to do it unless it's easy, so it's important we get that fixed. Thank you.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I agree.

The <u>Chairman.</u> Dr. Murphy, chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee.

Mr. <u>Murphy</u>. Thank you, Madam Secretary, and welcome. You had mentioned that the people the -- who did technology on the Web site made a number of mistakes. You mentioned Verizon. When we had them before our committee last week, they said it wasn't their fault, they were told, but then HHS, there were some problems there.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, Verizon wasn't involved in the Web site.

Mr. Murphy. I --

Secretary Sebelius. Verizon hosts the cloud.

Mr. Murphy. Right. With the -- with the data.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I just need to clear that.

Mr. Murphy. I understand that.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. They were -- not the Web site.

Mr. <u>Murphy</u>. But -- but they had a role, CGI had a role, over companies, et cetera. I'm just curious in this process, what decisions did you make that affected this, for better or worse, in terms of the data, the ease or problems with the moment and being able to track how many people are actually enrolled?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. My decisions, specifically to design the Web site, I was not involved. I am prohibited to choose contractors. We go by the --

Mr. <u>Murphy</u>. Okay.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- Federal procurement, and I got regular reports on exactly what was done and how it was --

Mr. <u>Murphy</u>. What about the part with regard to getting data in terms of how many are people even enrolled or trying to enroll? Did you have any decision in that process?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Again, the application process at this point does not work end-to-end very well --

Mr. <u>Murphy.</u> Right. I understand it doesn't work. That's obvious.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- and we do not have reliable data about

the end --

Mr. <u>Murphy</u>. I'm just trying to find out if you had asked them to say, look, I'm -- I'm in charge of this. I'm going to want a regular report. How many people have tried to enroll, how many people have enrolled. Have you -- did you ask that question in the plan?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. We have prioritized for our contractors that specific fix. And believe me, the insurance companies are eager for us to get reliable data to make sure --

Mr. Murphy. I'm just trying to --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- that their data matches ours, and that is not there yet.

Mr. Murphy. I appreciate that. I'm just trying to find out if you ask -- you've told them that was part of the plan and what they're doing.

Real quick. I'm hearing -- we're hearing from thousands of people who have had their policies cancelled. In fact, I heard from one insurer in Pittsburgh that just cancelled 30,000 individual policies. Now, they said they expect 50,000 to 30,000 to enroll in the exchange plans. Just so you know, to date so far the number of people who have signed up for their plan is 10, 10.

Now, I'm concerned a lot of these individuals and their families aren't going to be make it by January 1, so I'm wondering, do you know

how many families will not have been able to keep their insurance by January 1? Do you have any matrix that can help you understand what that number's going to be?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, by law that has been in place for a while at the State level, insurance companies must give their customers a 90-day notice about a policy change --

Mr. <u>Murphy</u> Right.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- or a plan cancellation, 90 days.

Mr. <u>Murphy</u>. I'm just wondering if you have a mechanism whereby you will know. Is something built into the system whereby you be --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Will I know if your constituent signed up for an individual plan? No.

Mr. <u>Murphy.</u> People across America. And do we know how many policies will be cancelled or be enrolled? I mean, is it 1,000? 10,000? 1 million? 5 million? Do we know?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. We know that in the individual market, a number of the plans being sold are not grandfathered and are not currently meeting the law. Those notices have gone out. We know that there are about 12 million people in the individual market. A number of them have grandfathered plans, a number of them have plans which meet the essential health benefits. So I can try to get those numbers.

Mr. Murphy. Well, let me -- let me put a face on that. A person

named Paul wrote to me and says, I'm supposedly one of the families that this act was supposed to help, but it's in fact hurting more, would make it harder for my family to live. We will have less money for food and other essential items. I have a wife and four children to take care of. Another person wrote, I received -- or I had a 2013 plan, which if you include the premiums and out-of-pocket, total liability was \$5,300. For 2014, the same program liability is \$9,000. Single mom writes, I want to convey I'm one of the millions of people who's having their health insurance cancelled because it does not meet the standards of Obamacare. I liked my insurance. I especially liked the price, and now I'm being forced to sign up for something that will be way more expensive. As a single mom who is self-employed, I'm worried about how I'm going to pay my bills.

I hope you have a mechanism to track who these people are, that she's not eligible for other subsidies, but the costs are really going to be driving her down.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, sir, again, I would suggest that there is no requirement that any of those consumers sign up for a plan suggested by their company at a higher price. They have now options --

Mr. Murphy. But the plans --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- without health underwriting, without pre-existing conditions, with some guarantees around how much

out-of-pocket costs that --

Mr. <u>Murphy.</u> She's searching around, and she can't find a plan she can afford.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- they never had before.

Mr. Murphy. She can't find a plan she can afford.

The <u>Chairman</u>. The gentleman's time is expired. The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Butterfield.

Mr. <u>Butterfield</u>. Mr. Chairman, before my time begins, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Chairman. Yes. Go ahead.

Mr. <u>Butterfield</u>. Mr. Chairman, I'm always sensitive to committee decorum, and before I do it this morning, I want to ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to display the Democratic Twitter handle.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Go right ahead.

Mr. <u>Butterfield</u>. Hearing no objection. Thank you.

Secretary Sebelius, thank you so very much for coming today. I would like to ask you about the document that my Republican colleagues have just released. This document is an authority to operate memorandum, to operate the federally-facilitated marketplace for 6 months and implement a security mitigation plan. This document, as I understand it, describes security testing for HealthCare.gov. It

says that security testing of the marketplace was ongoing since its inception and into September of this year. In fact, it says that, quote, throughout the three rounds of security control assessment testing, all of the security controls have been tested on different versions of the system.

That's good news, but the bad news is that it goes on to say that because of system readiness, a complete security assessment of all the security controls in one complete version of the system were not tested.

This document indicates that CMS postponed a final security assessment screening, but in its place, CMS did put in place a number of mitigation measures, and it concluded that these measures would mitigate any security risk.

Question: Are you familiar with this document?

Secretary Sebelius. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Butterfield</u>. Is it correct that this document recommends implementing a dedicated security team to monitor, track and ensure the mitigation plan activities are completed?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, it does.

Mr. <u>Butterfield.</u> Now, is it correct that this -- this document recommends monitoring and performing weekly testing on all border devices, including Internet-facing Web servers?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. More than recommended. It's underway.

Mr. <u>Butterfield</u>. Is it correct that this document recommends conducting daily and weekly scans?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Butterfield</u>. Does this document recommend conducting a full SCA test on the marketplace in a stable environment?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Butterfield</u>. Is it correct that this document recommends migrating the marketplace to CMS's virtual data center environment in the first quarter of next year?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, it does.

Mr. <u>Butterfield</u>. My understanding is that an independent security expert, the MITRE Corporation, is performing security testing on the code that powers the Web site on an ongoing basis. Is that correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That is correct. And MITRE did an assessment of the system, gave us a preliminary report. They are in the process of posting their final report. That did not raise flags about going ahead, and the mitigation strategy was put in place to make sure that we had a temporary authority to operate in place while the mitigation was going on, and then a permanent authority to operate will be signed.

Mr. <u>Butterfield.</u> Finally, do you have confidence in these and

other measures you are taking to protect the security of Americans' personal information?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I do, sir.

Mr. <u>Butterfield.</u> Thank you. This is the third time you said it during the hearing, and we believe you. Thank you.

What -- what you're telling us is that these remedial actions and the ongoing security testing from MITRE are protecting the security of the Web site. That's a message that is important for the public to hear. My Republican colleagues do not want this Web site to work. I am convinced of that. They want to block the ACA at all costs and even shut down the government to stop the law.

For the last 4 years, they have taken every glitch, every simple glitch and hiccup in the law and tried to exaggerate its significance, and that's happening today and it's so disappointing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

The Chairman. Dr. Burgess.

Dr. <u>Burgess.</u> Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might make a unanimous consent request also.

The <u>Chairman.</u> Yes. Go ahead.

Dr. <u>Burgess</u>. I would like to request unanimous consent that my opening statement, which we were not allowed to be give -- to be given could be made part of the record for this hearing.

The Chairman. No. Without objection.

Dr. <u>Burgess.</u> And further, I do have a number of questions. Many have come from constituents. I'd also like to be able to submit those as questions for the record.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Without objection.

[The information follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Dr. <u>Burgess.</u> And ask the Secretary for her attention to those so we could get answers, because they, after all, are important questions. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It just came to my attention that on CNN, the CNN's Web site, that the -- the site was hacked just last week. And I will be happy to make this available to you. I -- I don't think the --

Secretary Sebelius. The CNN Web site?

Dr. <u>Burgess</u>. The -- CNN ran a story that the HealthCare.gov Web site was hacked last week. And, again, I will get this to you, and would appreciate your response to that.

Mr. Terry had asked a question about he wanted to get the information about the number of people who had signed up. You said you wouldn't provide that, because it wasn't accurate. Would you provide us with the number of people who have been able to enroll on the telephone? The President gave an 800 number during his speech. Could we get a number of people who have enrolled on the telephone?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, sir. We do not have reliable enrollment data. We will have that to you by the middle of November, as we committed to. We are collecting State data, we are collecting telephone data, we are collecting paper data, we are collecting Web site data. We want it to be reliable --

Dr. <u>Burgess</u> Okay.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- and accountable, and that's what we will have.

Dr. <u>Burgess</u>. Reclaiming my time. The telephone data doesn't seem that it would be that difficult to compile since the number is likely quite low. Now --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. The telephone goes through the system, sir.

Dr. <u>Burgess.</u> -- you have, or the President designated a, I call him a glitch czar, Jeffery Zients. And you're familiar was his appointment to the -- to oversee --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I asked him to serve in this capacity, yes, sir.

Dr. <u>Burgess.</u> Many of us on the Subcommittee of Oversight Investigations in Energy and Commerce were not as comforted as you by that selection, because if you will recall, Mr. Zients' history with this subcommittee it not great. He was involved with Solyndra. We asked him to come and talk to us about Solyndra in 2011. He refused, requiring a subpoena to be issued by this -- by this subcommittee.

Will you commit to making Mr. Zients available to our subcommittee for our questions?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Congressman, you are welcome to ask

Mr. Zients to come before the committee. He is volunteering his
services to us for a period of time. He has been appointed by the

president to start in January as the head of the National Economic Council. He was the deputy director at OMB for management and performance. I am thrilled that he is willing to take on this assignment and help us drive the management, but --

Dr. <u>Burgess.</u> Again, his -- his appearance here will be important.

Now, a lot of people are asking if the President's words leading up to this law, if they matter. And the statement in The Washington Post today edited the President's statement to say, if you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan if we deem it adequate. That seems like a more operational statement, and especially if you go back just a few years into the Federal Register, and I'm quoting here from the Federal Register from July 23rd of 2010, just a few months after the law was signed, the -- the rules -- the interim rule for the -- dealing with the grandfathering written into the Federal record, because newly-purchased individual policies are not grandfathered, the Department expects that a large population of individual policies will not be grandfathered, covering up to and perhaps exceeding 10 million people.

I hope the President was apprised of that before he made these statements, because clearly his statement wasn't operational.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Again, that's an insurance company choice.

```
And that was a snapshot --
     Dr. Burgess. But --
     Secretary Sebelius. -- of what the market looks like.
     Dr. <u>Burgess</u> -- your --
     Secretary Sebelius. The President made it clear, and our policy
was to put --
     Dr. Burgess. In --
     Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- a grandfather clause in both
employer-based coverage and in --
     Dr. Burgess. Right. But in the --
     Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- individual coverage.
     Dr. Burgess. -- Federal Register, those were the comments that
were recorded. Now, I do have to --
     Secretary Sebelius. No. This isn't a government takeover of
anything. These are private insurance plans --
     Dr. <u>Burgess</u> I do have to ask you this.
     Secretary Sebelius. -- making private decisions.
```

Dr. <u>Burgess.</u> I do have to ask you this: You serve at the pleasure of the President, we're all aware of that, but we have had many of your employees here in front of this committee, and you do have to ask yourself, are they just being purposely misleading, or are they really not that smart? So I'm going to ask you this morning, for the

sake of the future of health care in this country, will you please ask for the resignation of Gary Cohen, because he's repeatedly come to this committee and misled us?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I will not, sir.

The <u>Chairman</u>. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. <u>Waxman</u>. Mr. Chairman, a point of personal privilege. I just think the record ought to be clear about Jeffrey Zients. He was invited with less than a week's notice to come before this committee. He couldn't make it that day. He asked for some other day. He went to OMB and had nothing to do with the Solyndra contract, and he did come before us and talk about it, but his sole role was to represent OMB. And I don't think he ought to have any -- there ought to be any disparagement of Jeffrey Zients. He's a very well-regarded public servant.

The <u>Chairman</u>. The gentleman's statement will stand.

Ms. Matsui.

Ms. <u>Matsui</u>. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Madam Secretary. Now, we all agree the Web site problems must be resolved, as this country invented and developed the Internet and the concept of the Web sites, so there are high expectations. The fact that the hired private contractors could not build a ready Web site nearly 3 years is inexcusable, and after its fix, I hope the administration

will hold those at fault accountable, but we can't lose sight of the big picture that when this is all said and done, every American will have affordable quality health insurance and health care. This is the goal, I believe, of all Democrats and Republicans.

The ACA's working in California, and it's working in my district in Sacramento, and I just want to tell you about a letter I got from a constituent:

Dear Congresswoman Matsui, as a self-employed contract employee, I've had individually purchased health insurance for 11 years now, insurance that has gone up every year, sometimes more than once; insurance that wouldn't let me add my daughter when my ex-husband stopped his insurance policy that covered them both; insurance that I have underused for fear they would drop me; insurance that has just dropped me anyway because they decided they will no longer offer individual plans. This could have happened to me at any time. I'm so grateful the Affordable Care Act provisions make it possible to get health insurance beginning in January for me and my daughter.

As all this is happening, I have finished graduate school and started my own business. Slowly but surely, things are happening, and I expect to be hiring my first employees in the next 6 months. The provisions of the ACA are helping me in this, too. I can clearly see what it would cost me to provide health benefits for my future

employees, understand these costs and build my business plan accordingly. And that is just one of the letters I received.

Now, I've also heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle complain again and again about how health care reform is increasing health care costs, but the empirical evidence shows something quite different. The recent trends in Medicare spending growth are really quite remarkable. Medicare spending growth is at historically low levels, growing by less than one half of 1 percent in fiscal year 2012, following slow growth in 2010 and 2011. The same is true on the private side of health care. Personal consumption expenditures on health care, everything from health insurance, to drugs, to hospital care rose by just over 1 percent in the past year. This is the slowest increase in nearly 50 years.

Madam Secretary, what does this data tell us about what has happened to health care costs since the ACA became law?

RPTS JANSEN

DCMN HERZFELD

[10:56 a.m.]

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, Congresswoman, you're absolutely right. In the last 3-1/2 years since the President signed the Affordable Care Act, we have seen a great slowdown in the extraordinary cost increases year in and year out for health care, in the Medicare plan, in the Medicaid plan, in private insurance, and in underlying healthcare costs, which affect every American. Some of that is to do with some of the features that are currently in place around different care delivery and different payment systems that we are helping to drive, given the tools that we have, with the Affordable Care Act: more quality outcomes, trying to prevent hospital readmissions, looking at hospital-acquired infections, medical homes that prevent people in the first place or help them stay healthy in their own homes and in their own places.

Ms. <u>Matsui.</u> So it's true that the private insurance costs are growing at the slowest rate in decades also; is that true?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That is true.

Ms. <u>Matsui.</u> Am I also correct that ACA premiums are coming in even lower than predicted by experts like the CBO?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, they're about -- on average about 16 percent lower than was estimated that those premiums would be. And that's the premium, not accounting for the number of uninsured or underinsured Americans who will then qualify for financial help. Since they don't have employer coverage, they get some help from the taxpayers paying for that coverage.

Ms. <u>Matsui</u>. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

The Chairman. Dr. Gingrey.

Dr. Gingrey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, when you spoke at the Democratic National Convention in Charlotte last September, one of the first statements you made about the Affordable Care Act was, quote, "But for us Democrats, Obamacare is a badge of honor, because no matter who you are, what stage of life you're in, this law is a good thing. First, if you already have insurance you like, you can keep it." And I end the quote.

I'd call this a red hearing that misled voters, intentional or not. Now, perhaps had you known that millions would lose their coverage, families would face financial disaster, as one constituent recently told me, or that the exchange rollout would be plagued by a multitude -- multiple delays we've seen, you would not consider it such a badge of honor.

The fact is your words and those of the President as he campaigned last year that "if you already have insurance you like, you can keep it" seems to be directly refuted by the millions of cancellation notices already sent to Americans just in the past few weeks. Whether your statement was inaccurate, or, as Mr. Hoyer said yesterday, not precise enough, it does strike me that millions of individuals who, by listening to speeches like yours, voted believing one thing now find themselves without coverage and are now scrambling to find coverage in a marketplace that offers more expensive plans with fewer options.

In response to my constituents' calls for help, I created a portal on my Web site -- no patches or fixes needed -- that allows those who have experienced problems to reach out and tell me about their personal experiences. In just the last few days, my office has received dozens of complaints regarding increases in their monthly premiums. I received one such notice from a mother in her early fifties, who just received a notice that not only will her insurance premium double, but she will also have to switch insurance -- insurers to keep her doctors due to the effect of the Affordable Care Act.

Can you imagine receiving notices like this? I can tell you that just in my district, the 11th of Georgia, many more are experiencing this situation. Madam Secretary, this is akin to telling seniors that in a few weeks their Medicare coverage will be dropped, or their

premiums would double. Now, I know that neither you nor the administration would ever advocate for such a policy, yet here you are subjecting those currently in the individual market to such government intervention. And I would hope that you would agree with me in recognizing that these increases are a heavy hardship on my constituents, on all of our constituents, Republicans or Democrats.

Now I'll get to my questions. You know the healthcare law included a hardship exemption from the individual mandate, yet the administration has failed to finalize the application form for the hardship exemption 3-1/2 years after we passed this law. As of today can an individual apply for a hardship exemption from the individual mandate on HealthCare.gov, yes or no?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I don't know --

Dr. Gingrey. I do. It's no.

On October 15, Politico reported that if the online system for getting into Obamacare coverage is rickety, the system for getting out of the mandate doesn't even exist yet. HHS says it will take another month at least for the administration to finalize the forms for the hardship exemption from the individual mandate.

Why has it taken 3-1/2 years to finalize a simple application form for an exemption from the individual mandate?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, sir, as you know, the individual

mandate is not in place until next year. We have made it very clear that if somebody is Medicaid eligible in a State that doesn't choose to expand Medicaid, they will be exempted from --

Dr. <u>Gingrey.</u> My last question. An estimated 16 million people in the individual market have or will receive cancellation notices stating their health insurance coverage does not meet minimum coverage requirements of the Affordable Care Act. The bill specifically grants you, Madam Secretary, the power to determine the criteria for a hardship exemption. Will you provide all of these individuals a hardship exemption since the Affordable Care Act has taken away their plan? Will you do that?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, sir. And I think those numbers are far from accurate. Ninety-five percent of Americans who have health insurance will be in a continuous plan, Medicare, Medicaid, employer-based, VA, 95 percent. Five percent, who are in the individual market, a portion of those 5 percent, a portion of them, about 12 million people, a fraction of those 12 million, will have a plan that doesn't meet the criteria and has not been grandfathered in. They are indeed receiving notices. Many of those individuals, half of them, will be eligible for financial help getting a new plan, and they have many more choices in the marketplace. So we will not have a blanket exemption for them.

Dr. Gingrey. Sounds like a hardship to me, Madam Secretary.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. Christensen.

Dr. Christensen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here. And thank you for all that you and your staff at HHS has done in implementing the Affordable Care Act to ensure that it would provide the many benefits that children, to women, to Medicare beneficiaries, and to ensure security to those who already have insurance as well as lower costs.

Of course, the biggest complaint has been about the application and the enrollment Web site, but we have heard over and over from you that those are being addressed. But you would recall, and I know my colleagues would recall, that Congressman Rush and I have always been concerned about those who do not have Internet access, those who are uncomfortable using the Internet and would not use it. So I just wanted to just remind everyone that there are other avenues for enrolling, either by telephone or by paper, either alone or with the help of a certified, you know, application assistant.

But my question goes to one of the rumors that's been circulating. There are many rumors about how the Affordable Care Act has affected part-time workers. And some of my colleagues on the other side claim that the companies are moving workers to part-time jobs because of the

healthcare reform law, and that low-wage workers are being detrimentally affected. And I understand why these claims are being made, as just another part of the ongoing effort to undermine the law. Would you take a few minutes to just set the record straight on the "part-time" issue?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Certainly. Ninety-five percent of businesses in this country are small businesses, under 50 full-time employees, and there is no responsibility that any of those employers have to provide health coverage for their employees. On the other hand, there are now tax credits available for some of the smaller employers who want to offer coverage to actually come into the marketplace.

For the other businesses, the businesses hiring 50 or more, there is a standard that says an employee is considered full time if he or she works 30 hours a week, and that really came from a market snapshot with help from the Small Business Administration of where employee benefits were in the private market based on hours of work, what was a part-time or a full-time employee.

What we know about the economic data is the high point of part-time workers was in 2008 and 2009, at the height of the last recession. It has been decreasing each and every year. There is no data to support the fact that there is an uptick based on the impending Affordable Care

Act. I am sure that there may be some individual employers making some business decisions about how many workers they want full time and how many part time, but I can tell you there is no economic data or employment data that supports the notion that this is an effect of the law.

Dr. <u>Christensen.</u> So, in fact, it's my understanding that part-time workers are at the lowest percentage of workers in many, many years right now. And --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, and for the first time, as you know, Congresswoman, part-time workers will have options for affordable health coverage. They've never had that before. They've never had options in the marketplace. They've never had some help purchasing coverage for themselves and their families. Their full-time colleagues have, but they have not. So they will have options.

Dr. <u>Christensen</u>. And just to be clear, I had another really long question, but the last part of it, it would be fair to say that at every point along the way, you expected this Web site to work based on everything that you had been told by the contractors up until that point.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I expected it to work, and I desperately want to get it working.

Dr. Christensen. More than anyone else, I am sure.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I can't tell you how frustrated I am, and we are committed to fixing it. And the only thing that I think builds back the confidence of the public is fixing it.

Dr. Christensen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Gentlelady's time has expired.

Mr. Scalise.

Mr. <u>Scalise.</u> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding the hearing.

And thank you, Secretary Sebelius, for being with us.

Last week when the contractors that built the system were here, I had asked them all under oath if they had actually delivered the system they were contracted to build, and all four of them answered "yes." So I want to ask you, did the contractors deliver the system that you contracted them to build?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I don't think I can accurately answer that question. What we know is we have a system that doesn't function properly.

Mr. <u>Scalise.</u> We definitely know that.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> As we fix things, we will know more about what is broken along the way, and I'll be able to --

Mr. <u>Scalise</u>. So would someone in your office -- somebody in your office oversaw this implementation and received the product.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's true.

Mr. <u>Scalise</u>. And they either said, this is the product we contracted and paid hundreds of millions of dollars to build, or it wasn't. Does somebody in your office have the ability to --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I think that we can say that the products tested, individually verified, individually function --

Mr. <u>Scalise</u>. But clearly it was an integrated system.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. They don't work well together. And --

Mr. <u>Scalise</u>. Well, but I used to write programs for a living. I developed software products for a living. If you're developing an integrated system, it's irrelevant if one isolated component works by itself, but when you plug it in together it doesn't work, that's a system that doesn't work.

One of the questions I had and others had, somebody in your agency made a decision weeks, literally weeks, before the deployment to change the system instead of going from a browser ability where somebody, just like on Kayak or just like on Amazon.com, could go shop for products, look at prices before they purchased, which is how consumers are used to doing this. You all made the decision to change it around and gather all their information first before you could let them see prices. Was that you who made that decision?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, sir.

Mr. Scalise. Was that Ms. Tavenner?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> It was Ms. Tavenner and a team who looked at not imposing additional risks on the system.

Mr. <u>Scalise</u>. Did that team make the decision because they knew once people actually saw the prices -- and we're getting reports from all of our constituents of dramatically higher prices than what they were expecting. Did you make the decision because you knew that when they saw the prices, they might not want to buy the products, so you wanted to gather their information first?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, first, I did not make the decision. I was informed about the decision. We did it in --

Mr. Scalise. Did you agree with the decision?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- September rolling off a number of features. And clearly they can see the products. Note, there is no requirement to buy anything.

Mr. <u>Scalise</u>. Look, I spent over 2 hours trying to get into the system. I never once got to a point where I could see a price. I did get kicked out many times and got some of those blanks screens other people got.

I do want to share some stories with you from some of my constituents, because we started a page on our Facebook and on Twitter. We are collecting what's called Share with Scalise. People are sending us stories. And we're getting lots of stories from my constituents.

I want to read you a few of them.

Randall from Mandeville said, "My healthcare premium went up 30 percent. That's over \$350 a month increase."

We had Michelle from Slidell: "Our insurance premiums are going up \$400 a month, and our deductible has increased."

And then you've for the Sean from Covington, who said, "My current plan through United Healthcare is no longer being offered in 2014 due to Obamacare. In fact, I received a letter stating that the new healthcare law was indeed the reason for the removal of my current healthcare plan."

Madam Secretary, what would you tell Sean, who liked his plan and now has lost it? And he was promised by you and the President he'd be able to keep that plan. What would you tell Sean now that he's lost his plan?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I would tell Sean to shop in the marketplace and out of the marketplace, and he will find --

Mr. <u>Scalise.</u> Do you really think that's an acceptable answer -- Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- and he will find competitive prices.

Mr. Scalise. -- to Sean?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Again, if United chose not to keep Sean's plan in effect for Sean --

Mr. <u>Scalise</u>. Because of the law.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, the law said if you keep Sean's plan in place, if he liked his plan, if you only --

Mr. Scalise. Sean likes his plan --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- applied trendlines to Sean, then the plan is still there.

Mr. <u>Scalise</u>. You and I may disagree over who you work for. I work for Sean. You work for Sean, Madam Secretary. Sean lost his plan that he liked. And there are thousands and millions of Seans throughout this country that lost the plan they like because some bureaucrat in Washington said, we think your plan's not good enough; even though you like it, even though you were promised you could keep it, you're now not able to keep that plan. I think you deserve to give Sean a better answer than you just have to go shop for something else even though you lost your plan.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Scalise. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. McNerney.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary, for coming today.

I'm going to follow up on Mr. Doyle's line of questioning. One concern I have with the fallout from the Web site is that many users

who tried to sign up and were discouraged because of the problems will now be too discouraged to come back once the site is fixed. So what do you plan to do to get those folks to come back?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, sir, we intend to invite them back formally, by email, by message, but we don't want to do that until we're confident that they will have a different experience. So fixing the site is step one, and then inviting people back to the site to make it clear that when our timetable is fulfilled, they have 4 months to shop for affordable health coverage on a fully functioning site.

We know we're going to have to spend special time and attention on young and healthy Americans, who don't start out thinking they need health insurance, aren't aware of the law, certainly don't want to use a failed or flawed site. So we're going to have to spend some particular attention on them.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you.

Have the software specifications for the Web site and its related software elements, including the test specifications -- has that changed since the initial rollout?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I know that there certainly are some changes, because -- since October 1st? I'm sorry.

Mr. <u>McNerney.</u> Yes. Since the rollout, the specifications.

Secretary Sebelius. The specifications haven't changed. We

are certainly fixing -- as I say, speed and reliance is one of the issues we're taking a look at. That's the performance side. But there also are some functionality sides that things do not work as they can, including the enrollment passed on to insurers. So we are fixing functionality. And I don't think that's a change in the specs; I think it is actually making the system work the way it should.

Mr. <u>McNerney</u>. Well, are you -- or is the Department doing prioritization on the problems?

Secretary Sebelius. Yes.

Mr. McNerney. Could you describe that a little bit?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes. As of last week, when Jeff Zients joined us for the short-term project, we asked him to lead a sort of management team. We have pulled in all of our contractors as well as additional talent that they may have available. We have talked to tech folks in and out of the private sector and insurance, some of their tech experts, to get all eyes and ears; made a full assessment; developed a plan for fixes along the way; have a punch list for going after those fixes; and we are doing a daily tech briefing and blog to tell people what we have found, what we have fixed, what is coming next, what the functionality is. And we intend to do that until it's fully functional.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Looking past the initial problems with the ACA rollout, do you think that the Affordable Care Act will be successful in bending the healthcare cost curve and reducing the fraction of our national economy that goes for health care?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I think that we have already had some -- some success. I think the goal is to continue to achieve that. A fully insured population arguably with preventive care, with an opportunity to see a primary care doctor and not go through the emergency room will in and of itself reduce costs. Having people identified earlier who may have serious problems in managing those problems will reduce health costs. But I think the delivery system also needs some considerable help in paying for not number of procedures, number of tests, number of prescriptions, but paying for health outcomes.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Mr. Latta.

Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And, Madam Secretary, thank you so much for being with us today.

Appreciate your testimony so far today.

What I'd like to do is I'll get these to you because there's so many we've received. These are questions that we've received from our constituents back home specifically about what's going on with the Web

site and for them. And so what I'll do, I'd like to get those to you.

But there's a lot of questions here, and a lot of thought's gone into
a lot of these questions.

But if I could start with last week's testimony when our -- four of the contractors were here. And in one of the questions that I had posed to Ms. Campbell from CGI, in her testimony she had stated that they delivered the Medicare.gov and also the FederalReporting.gov. And I had asked at that time were those sites more or less complicated than the site that we were -- we're talking about here today. And she said, of course, the site today was more complicated. And in the questioning and from her testimony -- and, you know, we've been hearing about this end-to-end testing that wasn't happening, that we had individuals out there saying that about 2 weeks had been done. But I'd asked her about was there a sufficient enough time when they did Medicare.gov. And the response that she gave me back was on Medicare.gov, which was a less complicated site, and she stated that "we had sufficient time to test equipment before it went live." I asked her in a follow-up then, "What was that sufficient time?" she said, "We had a number of months before the system went live at that time."

And then -- and I just want to make sure, because, again, you know, sometimes things don't get reported accurately, but -- in the U.S. News

there was a report on October the 18th of this year, and there's some questions going back and forth. I just want to make sure that -- you know, that you were quoted properly. Said, "'After 2 weeks of review,' the HHS Secretary concluded, 'we didn't have enough testing specifically for high volumes for a very complicated project. The online insurance marketplace needed 5 years of construction a year of testing,' she said. 'We had 2 years and almost no testing.'" Is that correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I don't know the quote. I never suggested that we needed 5 years.

Mr. <u>Latta.</u> Okay. That's just --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I don't know what that's from or what that --

Mr. <u>Latta.</u> That's one of the things we're going to check.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. We clearly did not ever have 5 years. The law was signed in March of 2010.

Mr. Latta. Okay. And then last week when you were down in Texas, you were being asked by a reporter about the system and the launch. And one of the parts of the question was that at what point did you realize the system wasn't going to be working the way that you envisioned before the launch, and why didn't we stop it before the launch? And, again, this is what was reported: "We knew that if we

had another 6 months, we'd probably test further, but I don't think anyone fully realized both the volume caused such problems, but volume's also exposed some of the problems we had."

Now, going back, though, to Ms. Campbell's statement that they tested more extensively on a system that was not as complicated, but HHS, CMS decided to go forward with only a very short period of testing. Do you think that was acceptable?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, clearly, looking back, it would have been ideal to do it differently. We had a product that, frankly, people have been waiting decades to have access to affordable health care. Medicare existed well before the Web site. Medicare is a program that started 50 years ago. The Web site was an additional feature for consumer ease and comfort. And so they were not launching Medicare, they were not delivering health benefits to seniors, they were putting together an additional way to enroll in Medicare.

I would suggest, sir, that we had deadlines in the law, that people had benefits starting January 1st. We wanted an extensive open enrollment period so that a lot of people who were not familiar with insurance, didn't know how to choose a doctor or choose a plan, had never been in this marketplace, or people who needed to understand fully what the law offered had ample time to do that.

So the date that I was, again, required to select for open

enrollment, that's, again, part of the statute, how long would open enrollment be. We picked that date. All the contractors that began early in this process in the fall of 2010, when we issued -- I'm sorry, 2011, when we issued the initial contracts to CGI and QSSI, knew the October 1st date. That was not changed. It wasn't added to.

As we got closer to the system, one of the reasons, again, that we pared down what needed to launch on October 1st was an attempt to minimize the risks to the system to get people to their ability to see clearly what they were entitled to, what the plans were, and, if they chose to, to enroll. Clearly the testing should have been longer, should have been more sufficient.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Bralev.

Mr. Braley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, people who are watching this hearing might be under the assumption that there's some kind of political debate going on over the Affordable Care Act. I think people in Iowa don't care anything about who's winning the political debate. They want these problems fixed, and they want them fixed now. And I think that's the responsibility of everyone in this room to make sure that that happens.

I tried to go into the marketplace on October 7, and I encountered problems immediately dealing with the security code questions which

required you to select dates. One of them was type a significant date in your life. Today is my birthday, so I put that in. I tried three different ways of entering that data and got a message each time: "Important, this is not a valid answer." Same thing for the third date entry. And a lot of times when you're registering online for anything, and you have to put a date in, there will be a little prompt there that tells you what the format is you're required to enter.

Do you know, have we solved this problem in the security code area? Secretary Sebelius. Yes, sir. One of the initial issues was just getting people into the site. And the ID proofing, which is a two-step process, one is that you give some preliminary information and you set up a password, but the second, to ensure that your personal data can't be hacked, can't be interfered with, is the second step where some personalized questions, which only can be verified by you, are indeed part of that.

Again, that was a -- an initial hold-up in the system. We focused a lot of attention on that in the first several days. It was fixed, only to then discover that there were system problems throughout the application. And that piece has been fixed, but I would suggest it also was a function of trying to make sure we had the highest security standards, that we were not cavalier about someone's personal information being able to be addressed and attached. And it was a

functionality that didn't perform properly, but does now.

Mr. <u>Braley.</u> One of the things that keeps coming up in this hearing, because you are from Kansas, is references to The Wizard of Oz. And people went to see the wizard because of the wonderful things that he did. And the Affordable Care Act is doing a lot of great things in Iowa. The Des Moines Register wrote that "Iowans buying health insurance on the government's new online marketplace will face some of the lowest premiums in the country. It's increasing competition in our State. Iowa consumers are able to choose from 40 health plans in the marketplace."

You've mentioned the growth of healthcare spending is at the slowest rate in 50 years. Fifty thousand Iowa seniors have received prescription drug rebates. Bans on preexisting conditions are allowing people to get coverage and switch carriers. And now insurance premium increases are subject to review and can be rejected by the people reviewing those plans.

But all of these good things don't mean anything unless we solve these problems. And what I need to know is how confident are you that the problems will be fixed by December 1st?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, again, Congressman, I have committed to that date because that is the assessment of both inside and outside experts have analyzed, and I think they kicked all the tires and looked

at all the system. I know that there's no confidence in that date until we deliver on the date. I am well aware of that, and that's on me.

Mr. <u>Braley.</u> Since Americans were supposed to have 6 months to sign up, would you support ensuring they still have 6 months by extending the open enrollment period for 2 more months?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. At this point, Congressman, they will have a -- fully 4 months of fully functional all ways to sign up. And again, there are alternate ways and the Web site right now that people are getting through.

The open enrollment period is extraordinarily long. It's about six times as long as a typical generous open enrollment period. And it's important for the insurance partners to know who is in their pool so, again, they can stay in the market next year and know who they are insuring. So we think that the timetable will allow people 4 months' time to fully use the Web site. They can use it right now, they can use the call center, they can go to navigators, they can enroll.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Harper.

Mr. <u>Harper</u>. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here today. I'm sure there are other things you'd rather be doing, but we welcome the opportunity to have this conversation.

I'm going to ask the clerk to bring you a document for you to look at so I can ask you a couple of questions.

If you can go to page 8 on that, I have highlighted an item there. But this is a copy of a CGI slideshow from October 11 discussing technical issues that must be addressed within the Web site. And on page 8 of what I've handed you, CGI recommended that CGI and CMS have a review board to agree on which issues can technically be solved and which should politically be solved. Was such a review board convened?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, I cannot tell you. I've never seen this document, and I'm not aware of this recommendation.

Mr. <u>Harper.</u> But CGI is responsible for the Web site, correct? Or for the operation?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. CGI is responsible for the application.

Mr. <u>Harper.</u> For the application of this.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes.

Mr. <u>Harper.</u> Does it surprise you that in a slideshow that they gave in October 11th, they acknowledge political reasons for --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, again, I've never seen this document. I have no idea what that means. Did you ask CGI when they came last week?

Mr. <u>Harper.</u> Can you find out for us if such a review board was done and if any decisions were made on political reasons or any other

reasons and find that out for us?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, I -- that question needs to go to CGI, but I can ask them to report to you.

Mr. <u>Harper</u>. If you will do that.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. This is their document, if I understand. This is not our document.

Mr. <u>Harper</u>. Would you turn to page 9 of that document, please? And it states "Challenges" on page 9 in this presentation by CGI. And it says, under "Challenges," "Unable to determine at this time whether low enrollment counts are attributable to system issues or due to users choosing not to select or enroll in a plan."

So those are two completely different issues, obviously. If it is a system issue, that's something you have confidence at some point will be resolved, correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Harper.</u> And if it's a user selection issue, that's an entirely different story; is it not?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Harper</u>. Okay. Now, when you used the phrase earlier about a punch list, that's -- that's like having somebody move into a house. Someone's buying a new house, and they go through, and they've been told this house is going to be ready for you to move in on October 1st.

They load up the van, they come in. And they get in, and it's not finished. Part of the plumbing's not right, the wiring's wrong, and they go in.

This creates the situation where, you know, we -- health care shouldn't be a zero-sum game. I mean, we want to be fair to everyone. We want to help people who are vulnerable, but at the same time we shouldn't have to hurt folks. We've got people in my district, in my State, who are getting notices of cancellation. They are being told of higher premiums that they're having. And these are great concerns that we have. And how do we work through that?

And I want to say I appreciate you accepting responsibility for these initial rollout failures that we've had, but who is ultimately responsible? It is the President, correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. For the Web site? I would say that we are.

Mr. <u>Harper</u>. I would say that the President is ultimately responsible for the rollout, ultimately.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> No, sir. No, sir. We are responsible for the rollout.

Mr. <u>Harper</u>. But who do you answer to?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I answer to the President.

Mr. <u>Harper</u>. So is the President not ultimately responsible, like a company CEO would be?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, he's the President of the United States. I have given him regular reports. And those -- I am responsible for the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. That's what he asked me to do, and that's what I'll continue to do.

Mr. <u>Harper.</u> So you're saying that the President is not responsible for HHS?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, I didn't say that.

Mr. <u>Harper.</u> Okay. So the President ultimately is responsible. While I think it's great you're a team player and you're taking responsibility, it is the President's ultimate responsibility, correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. You clearly -- whatever. Yes. He is the President. He is responsible for government programs.

Mr. <u>Harper.</u> My time is expired.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Lujan.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Before I begin, I'd like to ask unanimous consent to submit into the record some articles from New Mexico publications, the Albuquerque Journal, and Albuquerque Business Journal, the first entitled "Small Business Owner: Health Exchange Will Save Me \$1,000 a Month."

The <u>Chairman.</u> Without objection.

[The information follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I see my time did begin there, so I'll try to get through this, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, I was intrigued by a line of questioning by Congressman Green, asking questions about the individual marketplace. How volatile was the individual marketplace before the Affordable Care Act became law?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I would say it wasn't a marketplace at all. It was unprotected, unregulated, and people were really on their own.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. Madam Secretary, the Kaiser Family Foundation reports that over 50 percent churn out -- of individuals that have coverage in the individual market churn out of coverage every year. They either lose coverage, they are priced out or drop it. Is that consistent with what you're aware of?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's an accurate snapshot. About a third of the people are in for about 6 months, and over half are in for a year or less.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. So individuals that were in the individual marketplace before the passage of the Affordable Care Act did not have the same protections as those that were in group coverage.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's true.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. And would those individuals in the individual marketplace sometimes have higher copays?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Higher copays, unlimited out-of-pocket costs for often coverage that was medically underwritten or excluded whatever medical condition they had in the first place.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. So these were typically 1-year contracts. If they use the plan because they got sick or in a car accident or a victim of domestic violence, sometimes they'd be thrown off their plans, or their rates would go up.

Secretary Sebelius. Yes.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. I think that's important to note, Madam Secretary.

And I'm intrigued as well that my understanding is last month HHS conducted an analysis that found that nearly 6 out of 10 uninsured Americans getting coverage through the marketplace will pay less than \$100 per month; is that correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> They will have a plan available for less than \$100 if that's their choice, yes.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. And that number would be even higher, would be better, if more States chose the option of using Federal funds to expand Medicaid to cover their low-income population?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Oh, very definitely. That's just a marketplace snapshot. Those are people who will be in the marketplace.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. Madam Secretary, I don't think that I've heard anyone from the other side of the aisle today, my Republican colleagues, ask

you how can Congress work with you and support you in fixing this Web site and fixing this problem. I hope that we all agree we want this Web site fixed. I would yield to anyone that would disagree.

Seeing no one accepting that, I'm glad to hear that we agree with this.

Now, Madam Secretary, what can Congress do to work with you to fix this Web site?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I'm not sure that there is hands-on work that you can do, maybe we have some technical expertise, but I would say getting accurate information to constituents is helpful; letting people know that they can check out the facts and the law; that they may be entitled to some financial support; that cancellation of policies means that the policy that they had may not exist, but they have a lot of choices of new policies and a law that now says they must be insured in a new policy, that they don't have to be insured by their company at a higher price.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. I appreciate that, Madam Secretary.

Going back to the individual marketplace, Madam Secretary, did this Congress in previous years before the Affordable Care Act make it illegal for health insurance companies to raise rates on someone after they submitted a claim for going to the hospital or becoming sick or getting rid of preexisting conditions?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, sir.

Mr. <u>Lujan</u>. Madam Secretary, one last note here. It seems that we've received some horrible news here that there are bad actors already taking place of fraudulent Web sites that imitate the healthcare exchange or misleading seniors into disclosing their personal information. I've signed onto a letter to you led by my colleague, Representative Raul Ruiz out of California, to request that you prioritize fraud-prevention efforts. What's the administration done to prevent these fraudulent acts and protect personal information?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I can tell you, Congressman, that the President felt very strongly that that needed to be part of our outreach effort, which is why the Attorney General and I convened representatives of State attorneys general, insurance commissioners, the U.S. attorneys, and the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission, which has jurisdiction, to make sure that we first got out ahead of some of this developing consumer outreach.

No one should ever give personal health information, because personal health information is not needed for these policies any longer. That's a red flag. We want to make sure that people turn over potential fraudulent acts. We have put training in place for navigators. We have our law enforcement doing --

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

I would just note that we -- with the indulgence of the Secretary, we're -- we're hoping that we can have all Members ask some questions, but we also know that with 4 minutes, we're going to have a little trouble. So I'm going to ask unanimous consent that we try limit our questions and answers to no more than 2 minutes. And I've talked to Mr. Waxman. Is that okay? Because otherwise we will -- there will be a lot of folks who will not be able to ask a question at all.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Mr. Chairman, I would commit to if the questions get submitted, we would be happy to provide timely answers also to make sure --

The <u>Chairman</u>. Can I do that? So with that, we'll try 2 minutes. Mr. Lance.

Mr. <u>Lance.</u> I guess I won the lottery on the 2 minutes. Madam Secretary.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Time has expired.

Mr. Lance. Twenty seconds, Mr. Chairman.

On the Web site, Madam Secretary, the contractors testified last week that they needed more than 2 weeks for end-to-end testing. Why, in your opinion, was there not more than 2 weeks?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Again, we had products -- the insurance policies themselves by companies were loaded into the system. So we -- we could test up until then, but it wasn't until September,

mid-September, that that was done. And, again, the contractors said, we would have loved more testing time, but we think we're ready to go ahead.

Mr. Lance. I believe that will ultimately be a dispute between CMS and HHS and the contractors. And if there's anything we can do regarding that, because obviously that didn't work. And I had thought, given this signature issue with the President, that the Web site would be ready.

Number two, in my judgment, the President's statements were overstatements. The four Pinocchios is an indication of that.

There's a report in the New Jersey newspapers this morning that 800,000 people in New Jersey who purchased their policies in individual or small-employer markets will be affected by this.

Mr. Walden in a previous question mentioned the fact that in an individual market you would be able to keep your policy grandfathered. Yet regulations issued by HHS say that grandfathered status would not be continued for so much as a \$5 change in a copay. Is that accurate, and do you believe that that is a significant change?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, we gave, I think, in the grandfather regulations a guide for how pricing could change, medical inflation, and I think it was in most cases a plus 15 percent. There were some individual consumer outfacing issues that were more rigid than that.

But I would say that in terms of having companies being able to collect a profit margin, that was certainly built into the grandfather status.

Mr. <u>Lance.</u> I think that's too little a change, respectfully.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Tonko.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And welcome, Honorable Secretary. Thank you for fielding our questions and for responding when you were extended the courtesy to offer a response.

As a strong supporter of the Affordable Care Act, I'm frustrated, and I think it's fair to say that the American people are frustrated as well. And I heard you here many times this morning say you're frustrated.

I think by and large people want this law to work. When I talk to folks back home in the capital region of New York that I represent, even people who opposed the law initially aren't rooting for the failure of the Affordable Care Act. Instead, they want Congress to come together to fix these problems so that we can move on to real issues that matter, like creating jobs and growing the economy.

My home State of New York, which also experienced Web site problems at the outset, has now completed enrollment determinations on over 150,000 New Yorkers, with more than 31,000 having already

signed up for quality, low-cost health insurance. Given that many States have had success in overcoming these initial Web site issues, has HHS looked at what these State Web sites are doing as it searches for solutions to the fix HealthCare.gov?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Absolutely. And we shared a lot of information going in. I think that the hub feature that we have in our Web site that all States are using, including the State of New York, is fully functional, and that's good news for New York and California and others who are running their own State Web sites. But we are learning from them, we've shared information with them, and we are eager for all the help and assistance moving forward.

Mr. <u>Tonko</u>. Thank you.

Similarly, many States made the illogical choice of rejecting Medicaid expansion contained in the ACA that would help some of their poorest citizens get access to the healthcare situation. This is despite the fact that Medicaid expansion is almost entirely financed by Federal dollars.

Can you comment broadly on HHS's plan in the future to encourage more States to run their own marketplaces and expand Medicaid so that the law can function as designed?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Well, absolutely. Most recently, last week, the State of Ohio did move into the Medicaid market. And we now

have 30 Governors. I think 27 States have fully completed the process. Another three are in the process, Republicans and Democrats, who -- some of whom sued us about the constitutionality of the act, who are now deciding that for the citizens of their State, they want to be part of the expanded Medicaid. And we will continue to have those conversations. It's not just about the marketplace, it's also about Medicaid.

Mr. <u>Tonko</u>. Thank you very much.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Dr. Cassidy.

Dr. <u>Cassidy</u>. You said that only if -- an individual policy is only cancelled if it changes significantly. But, to be clear, after May 2010, if coinsurance went up by any amount, even by a dollar, according to your regulations, that would not qualify as a grandfathered clause. Just to have that out there for the record. I gather even by a dollar.

That said, I get a letter from someone in my district, Adrian. She says that, oh, she lost her coverage. She lost her coverage because spousal coverage is gone. She's gone on the exchange, she doesn't qualify for a subsidy, but that her premium and out-of-pocket costs, under any plan, is \$10,000 a year. She feels -- she writes this -- she feels betrayed by her government. Now, she has to sit there asking

herself, is this fair? If you were she, do you think that this would be fair?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Dr. Cassidy, I want to start by the amount that you gave is not accurate. I was told it's \$5, not a dollar.

Dr. <u>Cassidy</u>. That's for the copay, not for the coinsurance. For the coinsurance, it's any amount. But I have limited time.

Do you think that it's -- if you were she, if you were Adrian, do you think this is fair? Loses her spousal coverage, now it's 10K, no subsidies?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, I don't have any idea what she's looking at. I can tell you that, again, based on what we've seen in the market, what we've seen in the plans, people will be getting full insurance for the first time at competitive prices.

Dr. <u>Cassidy</u>. Well, again, this is what she reports. Do you think it's fair -- if what she reports is true, do you think it's fair?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I can't answer fair or not fair. I don't know what she was paying or what she was paying before --

Dr. <u>Cassidy.</u> That's okay. Let's move on.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Did she have full insurance?

Dr. <u>Cassidy</u>. Richard writes that his daughter received a note that his premium's going up because she's being lumped with older, costlier patients. Now, it's possible that the only people that sign

up will be those who are more costly. Does HHS have plans on what to do if only those who are more costly sign up and premiums rise for everybody?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I think, sir, that's what we're trying to do to make sure that --

Dr. <u>Cassidy</u>. But if only the costly --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- with the individual mandate --

Dr. <u>Cassidy.</u> -- sign up, do you have plans?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's the importance of the individual mandate that you've just outlined. Getting rid of preexisting conditions, making sure that people who come in --

Dr. <u>Cassidy</u>. But if only the most costly sign up, do you have backup plans?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. We will encourage others to sign up. It's why there's a penalty in place and why --

Dr. <u>Cassidy</u>. Is this to assume that there are no backup plans?

I don't mean --

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Yarmuth.

Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, nice to see you.

I come to this hearing with a little bit different perspective.

Kentucky is doing a great job with our exchange. As of this morning, we have 350,000 people that have explored the Web site, 59,000 started applications, 31,000 are now fully enrolled in new coverage, and 5,000 just in the last week. And I think, very importantly, more than 400 businesses have begun applying for their employees as well. So the idea that somehow this is going to be bad for businesses is not borne out in Kentucky.

Would it be safe to say that if 36 States had done what Kentucky and New York and California have done instead of 14, that the rollout would have been much smoother, and the Web site would have been much easier to construct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I don't think there's any question that the -- you know, in January of 2013, we knew how many States were not running their own Web site. In, I think, mid-February we learned about partnerships. So it was not until that point that we learned that 36 States would actually be coming through the Web site.

Having said that, we should have anticipated, we should have planned better, we should have tested better. I don't think that's any excuse. But we clearly are a running very different vehicle for enrollment than we thought we were going to run in March of 2010.

Mr. <u>Yarmuth.</u> On the subject of cancellation of policies, isn't it true that, first of all, the Federal Government can't require

insurance companies to sell insurance?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That they can't?

Mr. <u>Yarmuth</u>. Federal Government can't require insurance companies to sell insurance?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, that's true. Yes, sir.

Mr. Yarmuth. And, in fact, insurance companies all over the country are making very difficult decisions now about where they want to participate and where they don't. And in some markets they are actually trying to get out of the market, canceling people, because they want to play in other markets and so forth. They are all making those decisions now.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, and we know we have more insurers, 25 percent more insurers, in the individual market than we did prior to the law being passed.

Mr. <u>Yarmuth</u>. So there are a lot of dynamics going on here that are not necessarily an indication that the President misled anybody. There are business decisions being made all over now.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, in cancellation of policies, again, the 1-year contract notice is a routine in the individual market. It has been in place for years. And for a lot of people, they are policies now; they are being canceled because they are being notified you can no longer being medically underwritten. We can't charge you more

because you're a woman. We won't ever have the kind of limitation on what your policy can pay out or charge you exorbitant out-of-pocket rates. Those policies will cease to be offered in the marketplace.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. <u>Guthrie</u>. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here. And last week Mr. Lau from Serco was here. I know the President's talked about the alternatives to the Web site is phone calling or using paper, paper application. And what he said, and I think you've said it with the phone, they take the paper applications, but they enter them into the same Web portal. So I know you get around the issue of getting on and getting logged off, but also -- but there are still issues with data within the Web portal. As you said, you can't even get reliable data who's even signed up.

So he also said because of the surge in paper applications, it's, like, 6 to 8 weeks to process. So if November 30th is when this will be ready that they can use -- and even if you do it now, 8 weeks, you're getting close to January 1st -- if somebody does lose their insurance, so they're signing up for this, and they get to January 1st, even though you have a March 31st open enrollment, what happens to these? Is there a contingency plan for these people to continue their insurance?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, I think that we have improvements every

day on the speed of the site. Serco was giving you early snapshots of difficulty of accessing the site. I think that's greatly improved --

Mr. <u>Guthrie.</u> Well, they said just processing the paper, actually. Okay.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I understand. But it is the site for -- they put the application into the site and get a determination. That's part of what the process is.

So the site is part of the portal all the way through. This is an integrated insurance vehicle, and so that will improve. And we -- again, with 4 months of continuous service, which is far longer than most people had, some of these cancellation numbers -- Mr. Geraghty again pointed this out from Florida Blue Cross, but it's true of everyone else -- these are not January 1st numbers, they are year-long numbers. So over the course of 2014, when an individual's policy is due to expire, that individual --

Mr. <u>Guthrie</u>. But somebody could expire January 1st and not be able to get coverage if the Web site -- and the vendors said they needed months to test, they would have liked to have months and months to test. That's what they said. So if we are going to get November -- even if it works November 30th --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I would say we're testing as we go. This

is beta testing going out right now. That's why we're fixing and how we can identify things. People are getting through every day. And we now know a lot more --

Mr. <u>Guthrie</u>. I know I'm out of -- but the paper process, if it does take even 4 weeks, and it's November 30th, and people's cancel on January 1st, you -- there needs to be a contingency for that person.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, again, typical insurance is 2 to 4 weeks of sign-up. They will have 2 full months of sign-up.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. Schakowsky.

Ms. <u>Schakowsky</u>. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for bringing to millions of Americans access to affordable, comprehensive healthcare coverage that's going to be there when they need it.

I want to thank you especially as a woman. Women can no longer -- being a woman can no longer considered being a preexisting condition. Women can no longer be charged more than a man for the same coverage. Women have access to comprehensive benefits like prescription drugs, and free preventive screenings, and free contraceptive coverage, and maternity care, which is often left out of coverage. And the days of complicated pregnancy, or diabetes, or domestic violence being a preexisting condition, those days are over.

You know, I want to say to my colleagues, after a 3-1/2-year

campaign to repeal, to discredit, to even shut down the government over Obamacare, I want to say, get over it. We all agree that there are problems, but these are problems that I see being fixed.

And so I want to ask one -- oh, and I want to say that what we did under Medicare Part D can be an example of how we can work together. And, in fact, Chairman Upton and I both sent a letter asking for more money for community-based groups to help implement the program and make it work. They can work together.

So if you could just briefly say how are the navigators; how important are they in making this system work for the American people?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, what we know, Congresswoman, is that a lot of people are not Web savvy and are not frustrated by the Web site, because they don't have a computer, they don't want to use a computer, they don't trust a computer. They need a live human being to ask questions, get questions answered, talk about the plan, talk about insurance. So the navigators play a hugely important role.

We have about 2,500 trained navigators on the ground right now. We have thousands more community assisters who are trained and ready to go. About 45,000 agents and brokers have gone through specific Affordable Care Act training. But those individuals working with their clients, customers, and, in the case of navigators and community assisters, just the public at large, they are not paid by a company,

they are not collecting a fee, they just want to help people get coverage, they are hugely important.

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you.

The Chairman. Gentlelady's time.

Mr. Olson.

Mr. Olson. I thank the chair.

And welcome, Madam Secretary.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Thank you.

Mr. Olson. I'd like to open with a quote from an American icon. I'll hold up a poster. It says, "If a user is having a problem, it's our problem." I'm glad to hear that you embrace this philosophy during your testimony, ma'am.

Obamacare was signed into law 1,256 days ago, and since then there's been user problem after user problem.

Regarding HealthCare.gov, your Deputy Administrator for Consumer Information, Gary Cohen, testified 1 month ago, right where you're sitting, that -- and this is a quote -- "CMS has worked hard to test the infrastructure that will allow Americans to enroll in coverage confidently, simply, and securely," end quote. Yet according to Forbes and the Wall Street Journal, you told them that you needed 5 years of construction and 1 year of testing. The program has crashed and burned at least three times, and the user is still having problems.

It's been down the whole time you've been testifying. The system is down at this moment.

My question, ma'am, is very simple: When did you know these changes were going down? A month? A day? A quarter? And did you tell the President what you knew?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, I was informed that we were ready to launch on October 1st. The contractors who we had as our private partners told us and told this committee that they had never suggested a delay, and that is accurate. Our CMS team felt we were ready to go.

I told the President that we were ready to go. Clearly I was wrong. We were wrong. I -- we knew that in any big, new, complicated system, there would be problems. No one ever imagined the volume of issues and problems that we've had, and we must fix it.

Mr. <u>Olson</u>. Yes, ma'am.

Credible journalists said you know you needed 6 years to get the program up and running.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, that quote has been repeated. I can guarantee you I would have never stated that, because the law was passed in March of 2010. I chose the open enrollment date. I don't know where that quote comes from, but that is not from me.

The <u>Chairman.</u> Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Barrow.

Mr. Barrow. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thanks for attending today, Madam Secretary. I suspect that deep down most people on this committee support the concept of reforming insurance markets so that more people have access to better insurance coverage. We have disagreements about the means used to get at those ends, which is ultimately why I voted against the Affordable Care Act.

But it seems that every day we're hearing of something new going wrong. I'm concerned that these short-term enrollment problems could become long-term insurance market problems. My constituents are already losing confidence in the Federal Government's ability to pull this thing off, and I think the only way to begin to restore their trust is to delay the individual mandate penalties until we're sure this system is going to work. It's not fair to penalize consumers when their noncompliance is not their fault.

We also need to take the time make sure additional fits and starts won't cause larger problems. Right now I'm less concerned about who's to blame, more concerned about what went wrong and how to fix it and how we're going to ensure it doesn't happen again.

Nearly all of our constituents want and need health insurance. It would be a huge mistake if we were so blinded by our love or our hatred for Obamacare that we miss opportunities to address its flaws.

Now to the subject of technical problems becoming market problems. Can problems of folks getting into the system snowball into risk pool problems where those who choose not to enroll can actually affect the cost of those who do choose to enroll?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Certainly. A risk pool needs a balanced market, so you need people who are older and sicker to be balanced with people who are younger and healthier. That's how a pool works.

Mr. <u>Barrow</u>. At what point are we going to see a problem having the risk pool if the tech problems cause -- affecting the folks who are entering? What are we going to look for? What are we going to use to decide something needs to be done?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, again, sir, we will be monitoring during the 6 months of open enrollment, as will our insurance partners, who is coming into the pool. That's why we want to give this committee and others reliable, informed data about not only who it is, but what the demographics are and where they live. That's part of our target.

Mr. <u>Barrow</u>. If things aren't better by the end of this next month, at what point are we going to start thinking about further delays and imposing penalties?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, again, I think that having a defined open enrollment period is one of the ways that you then make an assessment if you have a pool that works or not. You cannot have an

unlimited open enrollment period with any insurance company, because that really doesn't work.

Mr. Barrow. Thank you.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Mr. McKinley.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Last week -- last week the CGI representative Campbell said she had met her contract obligations and met the specifications. And she said the only problem she had was with pace, but that pace wasn't part of the specification. Do you -- and we asked her what you would -- you would testify to. Did -- she said you would testify that she did complete her contract in accordance with the specifications. Would you?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Sir, I don't think until the product is working the way it's designed to work that anybody has finished their job. And that's really my interest.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you. I'm sorry, with time, they've shortened our time.

So if she hasn't -- she hasn't met their specifications, but yet we're still using her, so is the American taxpayer still paying the money to fix the problems that she didn't do -- or her company didn't do in the first place?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. None of our contractors have been paid the

amount of their --

Mr. McKinley. Will she be paid for this work into the future as we go to correct this problem?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. We will make that determination as the work goes forward. I would tell you, sir, that as we learn what needs to be fixed, how long it takes, we'll know more about whether they delivered.

Mr. McKinley. I'm very sorry, but the time frame has been cut down.

Who owns the software now? Now that we -- this has been developed with taxpayer money to develop the software to do this --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> It is owned by the Centers for Medicaid & Medicare Services.

Mr. McKinley. So it's all owned by us. Okay.

Will they be able to use it by a license for other clients?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Not to my knowledge. I think it is specifically designed for the marketplace with these products in mind.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you.

Then last question to trying to work --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> And the clients are the American public.

Mr. McKinley. -- under IV&V, and she testified that she thought that was something we should have done. Under HHS, you -- you

recommend or the HHS recommends that for software development, that they should have an independent verification and validation program, but it wasn't used in this case. Can you share with us in the -- the time that's gone why we didn't use IV&V on something that's --

RPTS HUMISTON

DCMN ROSEN

[12:03 p.m.]

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Again, I don't think that's accurate, sir. At every point along the way, there is independent testing. There is --

Mr. McKinley. Independent.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes.

Mr. McKinley. You recommend independent --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. An outside --

Mr. <u>McKinley.</u> -- verification and validation. Not someone within your staff.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Pardon me? There is a -- there is a level of company self-attested testing, there is a level of CMS testing and then there is an independent test on each piece of the contracting; an independent, not CMS.

Mr. McKinley. You've acknowledged it wasn't done independently, and that's what the -- that's the --

The <u>Chairman.</u> The gentlemen's time --

Mr. McKinley. It needs to be done independently. People that do not have a --

The <u>Chairman.</u> -- has expired.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No.

Mr. McKinley. -- a dog in the fight.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. It isn't CMS. I will get you the information. There are three levels of testing. One of them is independent for every -- every piece of this contracting, yes.

The Chairman. Mrs. Castor.

Ms. <u>Castor</u>. Good morning. When open enrollment began a few weeks ago, the people back home in Florida who are helping their neighbors sort through the -- the new options for coverage, the -- the navigators, were taken aback by how grateful people are to have a new pathway to the doctor's office and the care they need, affordable options. The -- they're no longer being discriminated against because they had cancer and diabetes or asthma, and they are very grateful. They said -- they said to me directly it's like they found water in the desert.

Right now they are -- surprisingly, they said it's taking time, because people want to sort through all of these options before they finally sign up at the end of the 26-week enrollment period.

So we must fix the marketplace, we must, to meet their expectations. And we have very high expectations for you and for the administration.

But I think it's important to point out the Affordable Care Act

is more than just a Web site. It -- despite all the obstruction by Republicans in my home State of Florida, nationally, the -- even going so far as to shut down the government, millions of Americans are already benefiting, and they are benefits that are not tied to HealthCare.gov.

So, Madam Secretary, let's clarify what's working, despite HealthCare.gov. Is it correct to say that many of the improvements in the -- that the ACA makes to employer coverage and to Medicare, where the vast majority of Americans who receive their coverage, are not dependent on HealthCare.gov?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's correct.

Ms. <u>Castor</u>. And so the delays and problems with HealthCare.gov do not affect the millions of individuals, thanks to the ACA, who no longer have to worry about lifetime monetary caps on their coverage that previously sent them to bankruptcy?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That's absolutely true. And I think the quote that the President was quoted recently saying if you have health care, you can -- you don't have to sign up for the new marketplace was referring to that large portion, the 95 percent of insured Americans whose plans are solid, stay in place and move forward.

Ms. <u>Castor</u>. And I understand the frustration with the Web site. What I don't understand is why people are not similarly outraged by the lack of Medicaid coverage in many of our States. Do you find that

hypocritical?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I think it's very troubling that millions of low-income working Americans will still have no affordable option if States don't take advantage of the expansion program, leaving States bearing the cost of uncompensated care, families bearing the costs of parents who can't take care of their kids, workers not able to go to work, and people still accessing care through emergency room doors, the most expensive, least effective kind of care they could get.

The Chairman. The gentlelady's time has expired. Mr. Gardner.

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Secretary Sebelius, for being here.

Here's my letter. This is the letter that my family got canceling our insurance. We chose to have our own private policy back in Colorado so we could be in the same boat as every one of my constituents, and yet my insurance policy has been canceled. The White House Web site says, if you like your health plan you have, you can keep it. Did I hear it wrong?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Again, sir, I don't know how long you've had your policy or what policy --

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. Why aren't you losing your insurance?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Pardon me?

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. Why aren't you losing your health insurance?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Because I'm part of the Federal Employee Health Benefits plan.

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. Where aren't you in the exchange? You're in charge of this law, correct? Why aren't you in the exchange?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Because I'm part of the Federal Employee Health Benefits plan.

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. Why aren't you in the exchange? Why won't you go into the exchange? You're -- you're a part of this law. You're literally in charge of this law. Should you be any different than all of the other Americans out there who are losing their health insurance today?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I'm part of the 95 percent with affordable available health coverage, as are --

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. You're part of a plan that --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- most of your colleagues in this room.

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. -- most Americans aren't available to them? Why will you not agree to go into the exchange?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I am not eligible for the exchange.

Mr. <u>Gardner.</u> I went into the exchange.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Because I have coverage in --

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. You can decide --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- the employee side.

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. -- to drop the coverage of your employer. You have the choice to decide not to choose --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I -- that is not true, sir.

Mr. Gardner. I chose not to go into the congressional --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Members of Congress are now part of the exchange thanks to an amendment --

Mr. Gardner. Before --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- that was added by Congress, but I am not eligible --

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. Madam Secretary, with all due respect --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. If I have affordable coverage in my workplace, I am not eligible to go into the marketplace.

Mr. <u>Gardner.</u> With all due respect, Madam, I would --Secretary Sebelius. That's part of the law.

Mr. <u>Gardner</u> -- Madam Secretary, I would encourage you to be just like the American people and enter the exchange --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I --

Mr. <u>Gardner.</u> -- and agree to find a way to do that, Madam Chair. Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> It's illegal.

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. Madam Secretary. And I would like to show you an advertisement that's going on in Colorado right now. This is an advertisement that a board member of the Colorado exchange has put

```
forward. Do you agree with this kind of advertising for --
     Secretary Sebelius. I --
     Mr. Gardner. -- Obamacare?
     Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I can't see it. And, again, it's --
     Mr. Gardner. It's a college student doing a keg stand.
     Secretary Sebelius. If the Colorado exchange did that, they
are --
     Mr. Gardner. Do you approve of this kind of advertising?
     Secretary Sebelius. -- a State-based marketplace.
     Mr. Gardner. Do you approve of this kind of advertising?
     Secretary Sebelius. I -- I don't see it. I don't know what it
is, and I did not approve it. This is a State-based marketplace.
     Mr. Gardner. That's pretty big font, that's a pretty big picture
of a keg --
     Secretary Sebelius. I --
     Mr. <u>Gardner</u> -- and you can't see it?
     Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, do I approve of it.
     Mr. Gardner. You --
     Secretary Sebelius. I've never seen it.
     Mr. Gardner. You have the ability to opt out, by the way, as a
Federal employee. You could take the insurance. So I just --
     Secretary Sebelius. If I have --
```

Mr. <u>Gardner.</u> I would encourage you to make that decision.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- available employer-based coverage, I
am --

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. I would also like to submit a --Secretary Sebelius. -- ineligible for --

Mr. <u>Gardner</u>. -- waiver from my district from Obamacare, and hope that you will consider waiving Obamacare for the Fourth Congressional District.

The Chairman. Gentleman's -- gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Waxman. Does your policy cover -- never mind.

The Chairman. Mr. Matheson.

Mr. <u>Matheson</u>. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Madam Secretary, thanks for your -- your time. I just want to ask, on the issue of the fixes to HealthCare.gov, we've had a lot of conversation about that today, and we've talked about confidence levels for being ready by a certain time, but I think one question that a lot of us have is can you define what the magnitude of the problem is? Is there a scale or a metric by which we can understand how bad this is today and how we're going to get to where we go to have it fixed?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, again, sir, I've been informed that the problems are in -- and the reports I've seen are really in two areas. They are in the performance area, which is speed and reliability. It's

too slow, it doesn't have reliable transfers. And in functionality. There are parts of the system that just don't make accurate transfers. So we -- we have done an extensive assessment. They are prioritized, as I indicated earlier. One of the priorities is the enrollment features which pass individual information to the companies where they want to enroll. That is not reliable at this point. The companies are not getting accurate data. So it's an example of the kind of thing we know we need to fix.

Mr. <u>Matheson</u>. And is there a way to -- have you set up your metrics to figure out if we're making progress in terms of if you're fixing those issues with speed and perform -- performance and functionality?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Again, with a team and Jeff Zients at the head of it reporting to Marilyn, there are definitely a comprehensive set of issues going forward that will be measured and -- and accelerated.

Mr. <u>Matheson</u>. Do you have target dates along the way if you want to meet the November 30th time to assume it's functional at what you want, do you have target or metrics along the way to make sure you're on that path?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. My understanding is yes, there are sort of groups of targets, that fixes, as you know, can be loaded together.

Mr. <u>Matheson</u>. Right.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. It isn't one at a time, so they don't take days, but they're trying to determine with a specific path, it's one of the charges that QSSI has really looking at the umbrella of what needs to be fixed, prioritizing them, figuring out what destabilizes if something else is fixed, how they can be grouped together, and that report will be in later next week.

Mr. <u>Matheson</u>. Okay.

The Chairman. The gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Pompeo.

Mr. <u>Pompeo.</u> Great. Thank you. Thank you for coming,

Secretary Sebelius. It won't surprise you that I would like to talk
about Kansas a little bit today. Much like with some of my -- some
of my colleagues that made references to the "Wizard of Oz," I don't
think anybody not from Kansas should be able to do Oz allegories, but
my -- my story, the way I think about it is those folks worked awful
hard to go down that yellow brick road, and at the end of the day when
they got there and pulled back the curtain, they found out there was
nothing that they didn't already have. And as we pull back the curtain
on the Affordable Care Act, I think people are finding that it's not
exactly what they are going to have worked so hard to find their way
to as well.

I want to talk about two stories. There -- there's this

commitment that said if you like your plan, you can keep it. I have a letter I'll submit for the record from Mr. Brito in Kansas. You might know him. I saw him the other night in Benton. He got the following letter from Blue Cross Blue Shield that says, because your current plan does not offer the benefits standards specified, you will be discontinued on December 31st. And it says, good news. And then there's a group of folks, Pizza Hut, you know the company from Kansas, franchisees, founded there.

Secretary Sebelius. Yes, I do.

Mr. <u>Pompeo.</u> Lots of those folks have now taken employees, families who were working there, and they've gone from having full-time jobs to part-time jobs, so they aren't able to keep the health care plan that they had either and the one that they wanted.

What do you tell -- why -- why were the plans these folks had good enough when you were the insurance commissioner in Kansas and when you were Kansas's governor, but those plans today aren't good enough for those hardworking Kansas families?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, I would tell you in the roles I had the honor of serving of in Kansas, I worked every day to try and eliminate some of the discriminatory features of the insurance industry that finally, with the Affordable Care Act, are gone. My successor and elected insurance Republican commissioner, Sandy Praeger and I worked

on a whole series of plans to expand coverage. So I did --

Mr. Pompeo. But --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- work on these issues. We were not able to necessarily --

Mr. Pompeo. So you -- you thought these --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- get them passed.

Mr. <u>Pompeo</u>. To use your words, you said these were, I think you said, lousy plans, and Ms. Tavenner said, not true insurance. You think that the plans that were offered when you were insurance commissioner weren't true insurance?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> In the individual market, the insurance commissioner in Kansas and virtually every place in the country --

Mr. Pompeo. So if the --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- does not have regulatory authority over the plans --

Mr. <u>Pompeo.</u> Let me ask the questions.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- and a lot of them are not insurance.

Mr. <u>Pompeo.</u> Were they true insurance plans when you were insurance commissioner?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> A lot of them were not true insurance plans, no.

Mr. <u>Pompeo.</u> Thank you. I yield back.

The Chairman. Gentleman from Vermont, Mr. Welch.

Mr. <u>Welch</u>. Thank you. I'm going to try to just summarize correctly what I've been hearing. Number one, the Web site must be fixed, you've been very forthright, and you're going to fix it.

Number two, I'm hearing a tone change. We've had a real battle about health care. We had a battle in this Congress. It was passed. The President signed it. The Supreme Court affirmed it. A really brutal battle. There was an election where the American people affirmed it. And then the last gasp effort was the shutdown and the threat of debt default. But what I'm hearing today is that there are problems and people want to fix them, because all of us represent people who are going to win or lose depending upon how effectively this is rolled out.

Third, there's some significant question about existing insurance policies, what the President said and so on, but let's acknowledge something. A lot of insurance companies were ripping off innocent American people by promising them insurance until they got sick, and then it got canceled because they "had a pre-existing condition that wasn't, 'disclosed.'" That's got to end. The challenge for us going forward is to make health care affordable.

So, Madam Secretary, my question is, is there any indication that there's been a slowing of premium increases as a result of the

Affordable Care Act, because unless we can keep those premium increases down, they can't rise faster than the rate of inflation, wages and profits, all of us are going to lose.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I would say the trends in the private market over the last 3-1/2 years are that cost increases have slowed down, are rising at a lower rate than the decades before. And, in fact, in this individual market, the old individual market, the typical increase was 16 percent year in and year out, rate increase, and often that came with additional medical underwriting. So it gives you a sense of how the costs were.

We know that Medicare costs are down. We know that Medicaid costs actually had a decrease per capita last year, not an increase per capita, and underlying health care costs are down.

These rates in the new marketplace, have come in about 16 percent lower on average than was projected; not by us, but by the Congressional Budget Office. And we know that in many of these markets, they're much more competitive. I believe in market competitiveness. That actually drives down rates. The States where the most companies are participating have the lowest rates. And new companies have come in significantly below the old monopoly companies that often dominated this individual marketplace. So we're on a pathway. Are we there? No. But you're absolutely right: affordable coverage at the end of

the day for everybody is the goal.

Mr. Welch. Okay. I yield back. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

The <u>Chairman.</u> Madam Secretary, I'm trying to make sure that you're out of here by 12:30 before we start the second round of questions.

Mr. -- Mr. Kinzinger.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That was a joke, right.

Mr. McKinley. I see -- I see sheer panic.

Madam Secretary, thank you for being here. You stated earlier to Mr. Harper that you give the President regular updates on the marketplace. The President stated that he knew nothing about the status and functionality of the marketplace. How often and what were the subjects of those updates?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I think there were a series of regular meetings with the President, with some of our Federal partners, with offices of the White House, from the OMB to others on a monthly basis giving reports on policy and where we were going. None of those, I would say, involved detailed operational discussions. That wasn't the level. It was, are we coming together? Do we have companies? Do we have plans?

Mr. McKinley. Sure. And I understand that. I mean, obviously when it comes to the President of the United States, certain level of

details, you have to see it kind of a 10, 20,000-foot overview, but in terms of the actual functionality, whether it's the Web site or the marketplace, he was legitimately caught off guard on October --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, I assured him and -- that we were ready to go. Everyone knew with a big plan that there were likely to be some problems. No one --

Mr. <u>Kinzinger</u>. Okay.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- anticipated this level of problems.

Mr. <u>Kinzinger</u>. And just a second, a quick question. Where is HHS getting the money to pay for these fixes? Is it coming from other HHS accounts? Have you used your transfer authority to move money from non-ACA programs to pay for the cost of implementing the President's health care program, and if so, from which programs have you drawn money to help with the fix that's not ACA-related?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, as you know, Congressman, it's been 2 years since we've had a budget at HHS and we also have not had -- at the President's requested implementation budget authorized by the Congress, each of those years we have used not only resources internally, but I do have legal transfer authority that I've used and a non-recurring expense fund. We will get you all the details of that.

Mr. Kinzinger. Great. Thank you.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. We've been reporting that to Congress

regularly.

Mr. <u>Kinzinger.</u> So the answer is yes, though, there is some non-ACA money being transferred and used for the implementation of ACA?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. There is money that is specifically designed for either outreach and education, so the health centers have hired education outreach people as part of their outreach for health personnel. I would say it's definitely a related cause to get expanded health care.

Mr. <u>Kinzinger.</u> Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Mr. Sarbanes.

Mr. <u>Sarbanes</u>. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here. My understanding is that a lot of the companies, insurers that have been offering plans in the individual market, the ones who are sending out these notices are actually repositioning themselves in the health insurance exchange to offer alternative plans. Is that --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. True.

Mr. Sarbanes. -- correct?

Secretary Sebelius. Yes.

Mr. <u>Sarbanes</u>. And in addition to -- to those insurers who've been in the individual market, you now have a lot of other companies and insurers providing plans in the health insurance market?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That is true.

Mr. <u>Sarbanes</u>. So the way I look at this is, you know, I went to buy Oriole tickets a while back when the season was still underway, and I was standing in line and I got up to the ticket window, and they closed the window, but I didn't have to go home, because they opened another window a few feet away.

So essentially what's happening is people are coming up on the renewal period, they're getting up to the window of the individual market, they're being told, well, that window's closed, but if you go right down the line here, there's another window that's open. And, by the way, when you get there, you will get better coverage potentially at reduced premiums, and if you go down to window three, there's some subsidies that may also be available to you.

So this notion that people are being turned away from an affordable product that provides good, quality care is preposterous. In fact, they're being steered to a place where they can get good quality coverage, in many instances much better than the coverage that they had before, at an affordable rate that is supported by the subsidies that can be available to many, many people.

This is -- this is what's so promising about the Affordable Care

Act, and so I think it's important for people to understand that that

window is not being shut, they're just being steered someplace else

where they can get a good opportunity.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. And I think the first option for those companies is to say we'd like to keep you here and here are the plans we're offering, but to be fair, customers will now have an opportunity to look across a landscape, which they couldn't before, they will have entry into those other windows, which many of them didn't have before with a pre-existing condition, and as you say, about 50 percent of this market will have financial help in purchasing health insurance, which none of them had before.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Griffith.

Mr. Griffith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Earlier in your testimony here today, you said a couple times the plans we enjoy, but then as you noticed with Mr. Gardner's eloquent testimony, that we're not going to be in the same plan that you're in after January 1. I was one of those who thought it was a good idea as a part of a proposal that was floating around the halls here in Congress that the President and the cabinet secretaries ought to also be in the marketplace and not have a special Federal plan that -- that you will have after January 1, but that we will not.

The President, while that was being discussed, issued a veto threat. Did you discuss the veto threat with the President before he made it and have you discussed it with him since then? Yes or no on

the first.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No.

Mr. <u>Griffith.</u> No. And then I would have to ask you relating back to the contractors involved in this, CGI told us that the Spanish Web site was ready to go, that they thought everything was ready just as they did with the regular site, and obviously that didn't prove out, but that they were told not to implement it; likewise, the shop and browse section was ready to go. Do you think that they were misleading this committee when they made those comments?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I think what they believed is that that product, independent of the entire operational site, was ready and tested. What -- a determination was made. I was involved with the Spanish Web site --

Mr. Griffith. Let me --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- and the Medicaid transfers to say let's minimize the risk for the whole site, let's load --

Mr. Griffith. But let --

Secretary Sebelius. -- these later.

Mr. <u>Griffith</u>. But that raises the next question now, because one of the other contractors, QSSI, I believe it was, indicated to us that -- that part of the problem was was that once you took away the ability to browse, everybody had to go through the business of setting

up an account, and you stopped one of the browse -- or CMS stopped one of the browsing options as well, and that that actually contributed to -- to the logjam and contributed to the problems. So isn't it -- is he correct on that, that not allowing people just to look without having to sign up, wouldn't that have made it easier for the American people?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. In hindsight, I think that probably would have been advantageous. I can tell you that the reason the decision was made going forward was to minimize risk. That didn't work so well, but adding additional features that didn't involve people actually wanting to get to what they would independently pay and what they would qualify for and what the plans were seemed to be things that could be added down the road. It was wrong.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Bilirakis.

Mr. <u>Bilirakis</u>. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it very much. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for testifying today.

Madam Secretary, over the week, The New York Times wrote the following: Project managers at the Department of Health and Human Services assured the White House that any remaining problems could be worked out once the Web site went live, but other senior officials predicted serious trouble and advised delaying the rollout.

Can you confirm if this is true? Did any senior department officials predict serious problems, and did any senior department

officials advise delaying the rollout of the exchanges or parts of the exchanges on October 1st? Can you --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I can tell you that no senior official reporting to me ever advised me that we should delay. You heard from the contractors on the 24th that none of them advised a delay. We have testing that did not advise a delay. So not -- not to my knowledge.

Mr. <u>Bilirakis.</u> Did they indicate to you that there were serious problems?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. They indicated to me that we would always have risks, because this system is brand-new and no one has operated a system like this before to any degree. So we always knew that there would be the possibility that some things would go wrong. No one indicated that this could possibly go this wrong.

Mr. <u>Bilirakis</u>. Can you name some of these officials that gave you that advice that there were serious problems?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Again, I -- we had a series of meetings with teams from CMS. I was always advised that there is always a risk with a new product and a new site, but never suggested that we delay the launch of October 1st, nor did our contracting partners ever suggest that to us.

Mr. <u>Bilirakis</u>. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Appreciate it. I yield back.

The <u>Chairman</u>. Mr. Johnson.

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. Madam Secretary, thank you for being here with us today. CMS was the integrator of the Web site prior to and leading up to the 1 October --

Secretary Sebelius. That's correct.

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. -- rollout, correct? You've testified that you've now hired an outside company to serve as the integrator. Who is that?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. One of our contractors is taking on an additional --

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. Who is that?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. QSSI --

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. QSSI.

Secretary Sebelius. -- who built the hub.

Mr. Johnson. Okay.

Secretary Sebelius. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. This is the same company that told our committee last week that they were not only the developer of the hub and the pipeline, but also an independent tester of system?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes.

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. You've acknowledged in your testimony today that inadequate testing played a significant role in this failed launch, so aren't you concerned that QSSI has lost its ability to be an objective

independent arbitrator in -- in addressing the problems that plague the system now, because they're part of the tester, part of the developer, part of the problem?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. No, I haven't lost my -- my confidence in them. I think the testing that they did is validating the pieces of the equipment. What we've said since the launch is that we did not do adequate end-to-end testing.

Mr. <u>Johnson</u> Okay.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That was not the QSSI responsibility.

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. All right. And in this new role as integrator, are you going to be paying QSSI more than they were to be paid under their original contract? I -- I would expect with this expanded role, they're going to get paid more. Right?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. That discussion is underway in terms of what the role will entail, what the outlines are, yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. Okay. Well, hardworking American taxpayers have already paid for this implementation once. Do you think it's fair to ask taxpayers to pay more so that QSSI can now attempt to do something that Administrator Tavenner and her CMS team were unable to do right the first time?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Well, sir, I think the American taxpayers expect us to get the site up and running. As I told you earlier --

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. Well, I'm certain that they did. They expected it the first time.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I -- I understand. And so did I. We have not expended the funds that have been encumbered for the contracts.

Mr. Johnson. You know, we --

Secretary Sebelius. We have not --

Mr. Johnson. Madam --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. And we will monitor every dime we spend from here on in and re-audit things that are going forward.

Mr. <u>Johnson</u>. Well, with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The Chairman. Gentleman yields back. Mr. Long.

Mr. Long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Secretary, for being here today and giving your testimony.

Earlier today you said that, I'm responsible for the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. I've heard you referred to, and maybe yourself, as the point person for the rollout, the architect of implementing the Affordable Care Act. So you are kind of the President's point person, are you not, for this rollout?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Yes, sir.

Mr. <u>Long.</u> I -- earlier you were asked -- and there's a lot of things striking about the rollout of this and about the Affordable Care Act altogether, but the thing that's most striking to me is that when

we have the point person for the rollout here and you're not going into the exchange -- now, I've heard you say that -- and you've got some advice from the folks behind you, but I'm asking you today, can you tell the American public, if your advisors behind you that if they happen to have given you some wrong information, if it is possible for you to go into the exchange like all these millions of Americans that are going to go into the exchanges, will you commit to forego your government insurance plan that you're on now and join us in the pool?

Come on in. The water's fine. All the Congressmen, all of our staff have to go into the exchanges. We have to go into the D.C. exchanges. And I will say that I tried to get on the Web site, I was successful, during the hearing earlier, and I got to the D.C. exchange, which is where I have to buy from. I got part way through, and then when it got to the point to enter my Social Security number, I could not bring myself to do that from what I've heard from people like John McAfee and folks about the security.

Will you tell -- if your advisors are wrong and it is possible for you, I'm not saying it is, but if it is, if it's possible for you to forego your government program you have now, will you tell the American public that, yes, I will go into the exchanges next year like everyone else?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Sir, the way the law is written --

```
Mr. Long. It's a yes or no.
     Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. We have --
     Mr. Long. I'm -- let's say that you're wrong on that. Yes or
no?
     If -- if you're wrong --
     Secretary Sebelius. I don't want to give --
     Mr. Long. -- will you, yes or no?
     Secretary Sebelius. -- misinformation to the American public --
     Mr. Long. You what?
     Secretary Sebelius. -- who may be -- I don't want to give
misinformation.
     Mr. Long. I want you to go home and research it --
     Secretary Sebelius. If you have affordable --
     Mr. Long. If -- if --
     Secretary Sebelius. -- coverage --
     Mr. Long. If you're wrong --
     Ms. Sebelius. If you have affordable coverage --
     Mr. Long. -- will you go into the exchanges?
     Secretary Sebelius. I -- if I'm wrong --
     Mr. Long. If you can, will you? That's a yes or no. If you can,
will you, ma'am?
     Secretary Sebelius. I will take a look at it. I don't have any
idea --
```

Mr. Long. That's not an answer. That's not a yes or no.

The Chairman. Gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. <u>Long.</u> You're the architect of the whole program, and you won't go into it with the rest of the American public.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> I did not say that, sir. I think it's illegal for me to --

Mr. <u>Long.</u> If it's not illegal. If it's legal, will you go in?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> If I have affordable coverage --

Mr. Long. Come in. The water's fine.

The Chairman. The gentleman -- the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. <u>Waxman</u>. I -- I have a unanimous consent request. I'd like to -- Madam Secretary, I'd like you to answer for the record, if you are able to do what the gentleman just suggested or follow the recommendation of Cory Gardner, our colleague from Colorado, and went into the -- bought -- to buy an individual policy, would you be able to find one that would protect you from cheap shots, or do you think that it has to be mandated for coverage? I'll leave the record open for your response.

The <u>Chairman.</u> We'll wait for that response to come back.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I'd gladly join the exchange if I didn't have affordable coverage in my workplace. I would gladly join it. And the D.C. market is an independent State-based market, even though D.C.

is not a State. We do not run the D.C. market in the Federal marketplace.

The Chairman. The gentlelady from North Carolina, Ms. Ellimers.

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I -- I have a couple of questions. Thank you for being with us today, Madam Secretary. I'd like to go to the issue that has been raised by my colleagues on the left here about accurate information. Number one, I -- I've heard the issue of Medicare Part D brought up many, many times. Although my -- my colleagues all voted no against it initially, now they're extolling the virtues of Medicare Part D. Is Medicare Part D a mandate or is it voluntary?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. It is voluntary.

Mrs. Ellmers. It is a voluntary program.

Secretary Sebelius. Yes.

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> That's the first accurate piece of accurate information I would like to get.

You know, we're asking -- or we're actually forcing millions of Americans to go to find a health care premium in some way, whether it's to go to the exchange or whether they are to be insured. Many of my constituents are being -- are reaching out to me, those with individual policies, and they are saying to me that my -- my rates are going up 400 percent, my rates are going up 127 percent. These are my

constituents. Now, you know, we're talking about open enrollment, but it's -- it's forcing the issue, is it not? That -- that if an American does not have health care coverage, they are essentially breaking the law. Is that not correct?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. If someone can afford coverage and has that option and chooses not to buy coverage, they will pay a fee on their --

Mrs. Ellmers. And that --

Secretary Sebelius. -- liability in their --

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> And it is a law, so therefore they are breaking the law.

Secretary Sebelius. -- next year's tax.

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> Okay. You also brought up the issue when you were in Kansas, that you fought against discriminatory issues. Now, I -- you know, as far as the -- the essential health benefits, correct me if I'm wrong, do men not have to buy maternity coverage?

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Policies will cover maternity coverage for the young and healthy.

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> Including men?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Under 30 years old will have so a choice also of a catastrophic plan which has no maternity coverage.

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> The catastrophic, but -- but men are required to purchase maternity.

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Well, an insurance policy has a series of benefits whether you use them or not, and one of the benefits will be --

Mrs. Ellmers. And that is why --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u> -- coverage for mental health coverage --

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> -- the health care premiums are increasing --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. -- violence --

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> -- as high, because we are forcing them to buy things that they will never need.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. The individual policies cover families.

Men often do need maternity coverage for their spouses and for their families, yes.

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> Single male age 32 does not need maternity coverage. To the best --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. He may not need --

Mrs. <u>Ellmers.</u> -- of your knowledge, has a man ever delivered a baby?

The Chairman. Gentlelady's time ---

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. I don't think so.

The <u>Chairman.</u> -- has expired. The gentlelady, Ms. Cathy McMorris Rodgers.

Mrs. <u>McMorris Rodgers.</u> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And Madam

Secretary, you know, although we were told repeatedly that if you liked your health insurance plan, you'd be able to keep it, we're now being told by the government that they have determined many existing plans to be lousy, subpar.

In reality, this law is becoming quickly less about helping
Americans purchase affordable coverage and more about compelling
millions of Americans into a struggling Medicaid program. In my home
State of Washington, 90 percent of enrollees will be in Medicaid;
16,000 of them coming into a program that they were already eligible
for; Colorado, 89 percent; Kentucky, two-thirds; Maryland,
97 percent. And this is -- these are States that are already
struggling with their budgets, wondering how they're going to cover
Medicaid, which is, as we all know, for the most vulnerable population.

So isn't it true that in States like Washington, they're going to have new, unexpected costs associated with a dramatic influx into Medicaid?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. Well, Congresswoman, the Medicaid expansion provision of the Affordable Care Act is --

Mrs. <u>McMorris Rodgers.</u> Could you -- could -- are States going to face new costs --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. The Federal Government pays 100 percent of the costs of newly insured for the first 3 years and gradually

reduces --

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. These are existing --

Secretary Sebelius. -- that cost to 90 percent.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. These were people that were already eligible.

Secretary Sebelius. Well, existing people were --

Mrs. <u>McMorris Rodgers</u>. And we know that two out of three doctors don't accept new Medicaid patients, we know that current provider rates are going to drop at the end of 2014. So isn't it true that existing Medicare -- Medicaid enrollees are going to further compete for scarce resources in these States?

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. If the citizens of Washington who are signing up were eligible for Medicaid, they certainly will be entitled to enroll in Medicaid now. The newly insured will be --

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. I'm -- I'm concerned --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> -- fully paid for. The doctors have additional fees.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. -- that the most vulnerable in this country are -- are going to lack access to the care that they they're going to receive. And I know time is short, Madam --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> Well, I think that's absolutely true. And in States that are choosing not to expand Medicaid, it's particularly

dire.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. It's --

Secretary <u>Sebelius</u>. So I would love to work with you on that --

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. It's existing Medicaid.

Secretary Sebelius. -- expansion.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. And finally, I just wanted to inform the Secretary, you told us several hours ago when the -- when the hearing started that the Web site was down. If you look at the screen, several hours later, health -- HealthCare.gov is still down. You promised this system would be ready on October 1st. You're clearly wrong.

So before I leave you today, I would just impress upon you, this is more than a broken Web site. This is a broken law. Millions of Americans are getting notices their plans are being canceled. I yield back my time.

The Chairman. Gentle --

Mr. Waxman. Meh, meh, meh.

The Chairman. Gentlelady's time has expired.

I would just -- I would do a couple things here. First I'm going to ask unanimous consent that the written opening statements for any member on the committee be introduced into the record. And without objection, the documents will be there. I also would ask unanimous consent to put the document binder and other documents presented to

the Secretary during questioning into the record without objection. So ordered.

Let me just say in conclusion, we do look forward to having you back in December to get an update on where we are, and we'll work with your schedule to find a right time and date early that -- that -- that week. I want you to know, we're going to want real numbers. You will have them by then, is that right, in terms of the -- the signup? You'll -- you'll have them in the next couple of weeks, so --

Secretary <u>Sebelius.</u> That's correct. We'll have them by mid November.

The <u>Chairman</u>. We look forward to getting those done. We appreciate, we really do appreciate your time this morning to take questions. And I apologize to all the members who we had to shorten the time, but those things happen when we have this much interest. We look forward to -- to continuing to get an update and look for your continued work.

Mr. Waxman. Mr. Chairman, and --

The Chairman. Yeah.

Mr. <u>Waxman</u>. -- from our side of the aisle, we want to work with you. And I would hope on the other side of the aisle, they would take that same approach. Let's do something constructive, not just negative attacks against a bill that I think is going to be a Godsend

for millions of Americans. Thank you for being here. Secretary Sebelius. Thank you. The Chairman. Thank you. The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]